

other no. contains index from 1871-1920  
T. p + index

May 8 '20

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE  
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

v. 50  
Jan-Oct  
1920

VOL. L—NO. 1.

JANUARY, 1920.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1920

FD

# CONTENTS

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>I. World Re-Construction and the Near East.....</b>  | <b>1</b>   |
| By Professor Herbert C. Alleman, D.D.   |            |
| <b>II. What Kind of a Democracy Will Make the World Safe? 16</b>  |            |
| By Rev. W. H. Feldman.  |            |
| <b>III. "The Book.".....</b>  | <b>28</b>  |
| By Rev. A. E. Wagner, D.D.  |            |
| <b>IV. Conservation in Matters Pertaining to the Church.....</b>  | <b>42</b>  |
| By Rev. L. Franklin Gruber, D.D.  |            |
| <b>V. The Ways of the Critics.....</b>  | <b>66</b>  |
| By Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D.  |            |
| <b>VI. Some Erratic Chapters in the History of American Lutheranism .....</b>   | <b>79</b>  |
| By Professor David H. Bauslin, D.D., LL.D.  |            |
| <b>VII. Current Theological Thought</b>   |            |
| In English. By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.....   | 110        |
| In German. By Professor J. L. Neve, D.D.....  | 123        |
| <b>VIII. Review of Recent Literature.....</b>   | <b>134</b> |
| The Lutheran Church and the Civil War—The God Juggernaut and Hinduism in India—From Army Camps and Battlefields—Occasional Sermons—Evangelism in the Remaking of the World—Social Evolution and the Development of Religion—The Spectrum of Religion—Day Break Everywhere—The Social Gospel and the New Era—Six Thousand Country Churches—The New Social Order: Principles and Program—A Commentary on the First Book of Samuel—Theology as an Empirical Science—Religion and War—Germany's Moral Downfall—The Confessions of a Browning Lover—From a Soldier's Heart—Premillennialism—Lincoln's Gettysburg World Message—Help When Tempted and Tried—The Person of Christ and His Presence in Lord's Supper—The House of Enchantment—The Winning of Willie—Bible Primer—The Strangers at the Door—Year Books for 1920—Negro Year Book. |            |



THE  
**LUTHERAN QUARTERLY**

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

VOL. L.

---

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter,  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1920

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**38998A**

ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS  
R 1922 L

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY 1920.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### WORLD RE-CONSTRUCTION AND THE NEAR EAST

By PROFESSOR HERBERT C. ALLEMAN, D.D.

When Bishop Berkeley wrote the line "Westward the course of empire takes its way", he was making, as the context shows, not a general observation, but a prediction of the rise of the Western Continent to supremacy; but his words linger in our memory because they epitomize the course of history. Man has gone with the sun. The waves of conquest which have not ebbed in destructive undertow have been westward. The outlet of congested populations has ever been in that direction. All attempts to reverse this order have ended in disaster and defeat. The eastward migration of the Semites came to confusion at Babel. The Hittite empire was rolled backward from the Tigris river. Alexander made a magnificent but ephemeral attempt to carry Greek dominion and culture to the Indus. Roman dominion in the East lasted longer but gave way in turn before the children of the sunrise. Great Britain has survived as a colonizer, not a conqueror.

The last world-power to fall a prey to the lure of the East was the Imperial German Empire; for the Great War, while it was fought out in Western Europe, had

its roots in the East. Among the many causes of the war which have been listed, historically none played a larger part than the building of the Bagdad Railway. Eastern supremacy had been the goal of European powers. Great Britain had secured the advantage of the Suez Canal, thus gaining control of the sea-routes; the Ottoman Empire held the key to the land routes. For a half-century the Western nations had been jockeying for position so as to be able to take advantage of the crumbling of the Ottoman wall. The situation in the Near East was very sensitive. The building of the Bagdad Railway proved to be fatal.

The building of 1875 miles of railroad in itself should not have upset the peace of the world. It is almost certain that such a thought did not enter the minds of the German capitalists who in 1893 built the Anatolian section of the road; but when it was disclosed that this was but a link of the chain which the government sought to forge; when the line was extended to Konia (Iconium) in 1896; and then, when the German Emperor made his visit to Sultan Abdul Hamid and his spectacular tour of Syria and Palenstine in 1898, entering Jerusalem by a breach in the wall and laying a gold wreath upon the grave of Saladin at Damascus, while proclaiming himself "the friend and protector of the three hundred millions of Mohammedans in the World," the suspicions of the European powers were aroused. For the route of the projected iron highway recalled in a romantic manner the most famous landmarks in the history of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia and the fact that the power that controlled them controlled the East. The struggle for their possession carries us back to the dawn of history. Here the powerful Hittite nation flourished, and before the Hittites, as Clay thinks, the Amorites. When Babylon, firmly planted on the lower arm of this crescent highway, was lured westward by the Mediterranean and discovered and got possession of the chain of forts which controlled the approaches to Egypt and Asia Minor, she became the mistress of the world. Egypt was a world-

power so long as she held Carchemish, the bridge of the Euphrates. Assyria blasted a sector of this highway—from Nineveh to the sea—with fire and rapine, and terrorized the world for a thousand years. Cyrus began his career by getting possession of the Asia Minor end of it, and while he held it the ancient world was at his feet. Two centuries later Alexander the Great began his conquest of the world by winning the western extremity of the well-marked route, and the Bagdad railway marks his advance. The Greeks lost control of the East when they lost their hold on Asia Minor, and the great highway was cut by the rise of the Pergamon kingdom, which the Romans, by shrewdly making it an ally, turned into a stepping-stone to world-dominion. Holding Asia Minor firmly Rome planted herself in the East for six centuries, yielding only to the hammerlike blows of Islam, while the Turks, by repeating Roman methods, dominated the East throughout the second Christian millennium. Napoleon saw that the East was to be conquered and Turkey eliminated, not by way of Europe, but by the back door of this highway. His occupation of Egypt was merely a preliminary step. His eye was on Palestine and Syria, the bridge over which passed the armies of world conquerors from the time of Sargon.

It is little wonder that the great powers felt the chill of an ancient shadow when the German Kaiser stood by the tomb of Saladin at Damascus and proclaimed himself "the friend and protector of the 300,000,000 Mohammedans in the world" and erected on the walls of the temple of Bacchus at Baalbek a tablet commemorating his friendship for Sultan Abdul Hamid. And when these strange manoeuvres were finally interpreted by boastful Pan-German publicists and the terms of the convention with the Turkish government were known, the natural result was to arouse all Europe to the menace involved. It was a challenge to the world that Germany alone proposed to dominate this historic highway and it marked the beginning of the conflict, which was finally

to be fought out on the fields of France and Flanders, between the ideas of nationalism and internationalism in the Orient, and ultimately in the world. The fatal error of Germany was to conceive of such a domination. Five thousand years of troubled history gives the verdict that the highway must be kept open if the world is to have peace. Israel had the vision but could not rise above nationalism. It was reechoed in the angels' song at Bethlehem. The verdict of history is the vindication of prophecy. "In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and Assyria shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian to Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land; whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance." (Isa. 19:23-25). The verdict of history in the light of prophecy spells internationalism for the world's great highways.

Just off the route of the great highway, in the sequestered hills of Palestine, the Hebrew nation had its career. Broadly speaking, this was from 1500 B.C. to 135 A.D. With the defeat of Bar Cochba the Jews were scattered to the four corners of the then-known world. More than a half-million of them were slaughtered, great numbers were sold into slavery, the land was laid waste, Jerusalem was razed, and a Roman colony was erected on its ruins. The Jew has been an alien in Palestine ever since. But now, in our world-reconstruction, when suppressed nationalities like Poland, Bohemia, Slavonia, Armenia and Arabia are coming into their own, the propaganda has been revived for the restoration of Palestine to the Jews. The name that has been given to the movement is Zionism, or Political Zionism—for Zionism is also a religious and an economic movement. It more particularly concerns us as a religious movement. As such it embodies the religious hopes of the orthodox Jews and the pre-millenarian Christians.

It rests on such Scriptures as Isa. 14:1; 27:6ff.; 35:1, 10; 66:18-20; Jer. 16:14-16; 23:5,6; 30:7; Ez. 36:24-28; 39:25; Hos. 6:11; Joel 4:1; Am. 9:14; etc., etc. According to these prophecies Jehovah was to plant Israel in their land and they were to go no more out. According to Isa. 2:1-4 (Mi. 4:1-4) Jerusalem was to be a religious center from which "the Law and the word of Jehovah" were to go forth into all the world. The classic dogmatic passage is Deut. 30:4,5: "If any of thine be driven out into the uttermost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee; and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which they fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it." The hope is always—particularly in the Talmud—connected with Messianic expectations. Orthodox Zionism "stands on the platform that the fulfilment of divine prophecy is not to be brought about through ordinary agencies—not even a Peace Conference—but by God Himself in His own time and in His own way."

Economic Zionism is a purely remedial measure. It has grown out of the pitiable condition of the Jews living in lands where they have been disfranchised, during the anti-Semitic movement of the last half of the last century and since.

The fate of the Jew in Europe is the great tragedy of history. Of pastoral training for centuries, made a wanderer by the destruction of his nationality, he was crowded into the ghetto of the city, with all its democratic tendencies. Excluded from the army, the land, the trade corporations and the artisan guilds, this quondam oriental peasant was perforce transformed into a commercial middleman and a practical dealer in money. The Jew, through no fault of his own, belonged to only one class in European society—the industrial *bourgeoisie*. When the mid (XIX) -century revolutions made the *bourgeoisie* the ruling power in Europe, the bogey of Hebrew domination presented itself. This was so exaggerated by the defeated reactionaries that it

proved a powerful weapon of autocracy and the occasion of anti-Semitic sentiment which swept over Europe like a fury. The new opposition first manifested itself in Germany and Austria. Notwithstanding the fact that the Jews, by their creation of the National Liberal party, had enabled Bismarck to accomplish German unity, under the pressure of the new Hegelian nationalism the Iron Chancellor forsook them, turned a deaf ear to the protests of the Crown Prince (afterwards Emperor Frederick) and allowed the anti-Semitic sentiment of the demagogue to have its way. But the Jews suffered more from the German anti-Semitic crusade on the soil of adjacent countries, chiefly because they were more numerous.<sup>1</sup> In Russia, where they were cooped up in one huge ghetto in the Western provinces, "marked out to all their fellow-countrymen as aliens—a pariah caste set apart," hated by noble and peasant alike, they were made the scapegoats of every national disaster, particularly of the Nihilistic outbreaks of the early eighties. In 1881, a drunken brawl at Elisabethgrad was the occasion of a persecution which rivaled the persecutions of the Dark Ages. A mob, hounded by agitators who declared that the Jews were using Christian blood with which to make their Passover bread, attacked and looted the Jewish quattrer. Within a few weeks the whole of western Russia, from the Black Sea to the Baltic, was smoking with the ruins of Jewish homes. Scores of Jewish women were violated, hundreds of men, women and children were killed, and tens of thousands were reduced to beggary. The "May laws" so restricted them that life became unbearable and multitudes fled without a destination. In Roumania similar persecutions pursued them. It was therefore natural that the modern Zionistic movement should take its rise in this region, and it was a Jewish physician, Dr. Leo Pinsker, living in Odessa, who voiced his project of what he called "Self-

<sup>1</sup> There are almost 7,000,000 Jews in Russia, over 2,000,000 in what was Austria-Hungary, while in Roumania there were, before the Great War, about 400,000, or about as many as in Prussia.



Emancipation." By this he meant "an effort on the part of the Jews themselves to secure a new home in some soil where they might live safely and develop freely without the pressure of the unequal struggle imposed upon them through restrictive governmental measures".

No specific mention was made of Palestine; as a matter of fact, Pinsker was said to be quite indifferent to Palestine. There had been Jewish colonies in Palestine since 1870, and that, no doubt, led the "Lovers of Zion", as the promoters of Pinsker's plan were called, to locate the first Zionist settlements there. The effort made a strong though largely sentimental appeal to the Jews throughout the world and won the support of Baron Edmund de Rothschild of Paris. "There is no chapter in the colonizing history of any people," says Sacher, "finer than the story of these Jewish pioneers. They came to Palestine ignorant of agriculture, ignorant of the land, ignorant of the people, miserably equipped. The government laid its dead hand on all development. It was only by stealth, and with the assistance of back-sheesh, that a house or a shelter could be erected\*\*\*\* They had to compete with native labor accustomed to a very low standard of life. They had to make their own roads, furnish their own police, their own schools,\*\*\*\*\*" But in the end all these difficulties were overcome, and today there are over forty of these colonies, with a total population of over 10,000, with good schools and a Jewish Technical Institute.

An entirely different direction was given to the movement by the introduction of the political factor. This was the work of the late Dr. Theodor Hertzl, who may be regarded as the founder of political Zionism, which has as its ultimate aim the setting up of a Jewish state in Palestine. The prospectus was set forth by Hertzl in his monograph on the "Jewish State," published in 1896, the thesis of which was that the discrimination against the Jew was due to the fact that the Jews actually formed a separate nationality and that there should be created a visible focus for this nationality. Through the

establishment of the Jews as a nationality an engine would be created by which diplomatic pressure could be brought to bear to secure the protection of the Jews everywhere. While, in one respect, this was only the logical extension of Pinsker's idea of self-emancipation, the plan of a Jewish state laid the emphasis on the nationalistic bond uniting Jews everywhere. A new turn was thus given to the Zionist movement, and since the first Zionist Congress held at Basel in 1897, through Herzl's efforts, the political note has been dominant. The last pronouncement of the Zionist Organization was an address to the Peace Conference, to which the following propositions were submitted:

(1) That the title of the Jewish people to Palestine be recognized, and the right of the Jews to reconstitute Palestine as their national home.

(2) That the boundaries of Palestine shall extend on the west to the Mediterranean, on the north to Lebanon, on the east to the Hedjaz railway and the Gulf of Akabah.

(3) That the sovereign title to Palestine shall be in the League of Nations, and the government be intrusted to Great Britain as mandatory of the League.

(4) That Palestine shall be placed under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment there of the Jewish national home, and ultimately render possible the creation of an autonomous commonwealth, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

(5) That the mandatory shall promote Jewish immigration, etc.

(6) That Hebrew shall be one of the official languages of Palestine, and the Jewish Sabbath and Holy Days shall be recognized as legal days of rest.

Now, what is the strength of the Zionist appeal?

First, the sentiment of it. The attachment of the Jews to Palestine has wrung the heart of the world. It is the plaintive note of the Psalms of the Exile.

"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,  
Let my right hand forget her cunning;  
Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,  
If I remember thee not;  
If I set not Jerusalem  
Above my chiefest joy."

"Rabinnical literature is full of apophthegms that express the positive passion of the teachers of Israel for the soil, the air, the water, the physical being of the national land. 'Whosoever walks four cubits in Palestine is assured of the world to come.' 'It is better to dwell in a Palestine desert than to live in a land of plenty abroad.' 'To live in the land of Israel out-weighs all the commands of the Torah.'" Despite the vicissitudes through which the Jews have passed, despite the changes that have come to Palestine itself this attachment has persisted as the one unifying link among Jews of all shades of thought. The longing to return to the land has been the supporting arm of every pseudo-Messiah from Bar Cochba to Sabbatai Zevi. Three of the world's great novels are interpenetrated by this hope. The possibility of the fulfilment of the hope, after all these centuries, stirs the imagination, and our sympathies respond, Why not?

Secondly, the persistence of the idea of a Jewish nationality. "Let it not be supposed," says an able advocate of Zionism, "that this passionate identification of the Jewish people with the Jewish land is an aspiration for some allegorical spiritual Zion that never was on sea

or land. The Jewish people preserve to this day the calendar of a land from which they have been exiled two thousand years. The seasons which they mark with observance, the times of sowing and of planting, of harvest and of vintage, are the seasons and the times, not of the lands in which they dwell, but of the land in which their fathers lived and from which they have been exiled." This persistence argues more than merely race-consciousness. The devotion to a cultus which was inseparably associated with the theocracy of "the chosen people" and the land of Israel, in these last days has led thoughtful people—many of them devout students of God's Word—to ask whether Providence did not design to restore the Jews to their land and exalt them again?

Thirdly, the conditions under which the Jews have been forced to live in other lands. It was not until the nineteenth century that the Jew gained political rights in Europe. Excluded from the participation in civic life about him he became a man without a country. So strong is the social instinct which impels people to associate themselves in political movements that, if a man does not have a real country, he creates an ideal one. The Jew, scattered through Christian Europe but stigmatized as a political outcast, segregated as an alien and not infrequently hounded by the mob, clung to his nationalistic hopes as the only solace for his great deprivations. The treatment to which the Jew has been subjected has made him the Ishmael of the modern world. "The Zionist hope became for the Jews", writes one of them, "the only rock to which they could cling in the storm that raged about them—the beacon light that illumined the darkness of their lives and enabled them to retain their faith in a protecting Providence amidst the injustice of which they were the perpetual victims." In this day of restitution among the nations, therefore, it would seem that the Zionist claim should be allowed as a matter of compensatory justice.

What is to be said in reply?

First, the sentiment is appealing, but Zionism as a

political program is an anachronism. Political Zionism lays the emphasis in Judaism on the civic organization. Now it is true that Judaism had historical significance as a nation. At the period in which the Hebrews flourished as a nation they were influenced by the religious conceptions which prevailed in the world. Their religion was a national religion. Jahweh was their god, and the people, as a group, in virtue of his choice of them, were his "chosen people." In one sense they were his people as other nations claimed to be the chosen people of their gods. Jahweh dwelt among them and he did not dwell with their enemies. His presence went with his ark, and his ark could not be held by their foes. Witness the disaster to the Philistines in the capture of the ark at Ebenezer and its return by them (I Sam. 4-6). Even so late as David's time this view prevailed, for David counted it the chief hardship of his banishment that he was being sent out of the land of Jahweh. It is the tragedy of Israel that it mistook its own significance as a theocracy. It perverted the God of Moses into a mere tribal defender like Chemosh and Milcom. The Hebrews had asked for a king; i.e., they staked their trust on the civic organization, of which the king was to be the visible agent of their god's protective care. That Jahweh would ever desert them if they met their ritual obligations seems not to have been in their psychology. It was the mission of the prophets of the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. to disclose to the Hebrews the real nature of the God who had chosen them by proclaiming that he is a God of righteousness and that his protection of his people is conditioned upon *their* righteousness. Sin was the great apostasy, sacrifice and offerings were an abomination when his worshippers came into his temple with unclean hands. Israel was wedded to nationalism and went down to captivity and subjection because it failed to adjust itself to the new revelation. "The religion of the prophets," says Jastrow, "is the swan song of ancient Hebraism." The ancient Hebrews disappeared and were known after the Babylonian cap-

tivity as the Jews. From the standpoint of the later writers the reconstitution of the Jews as a political unit was a misfortune. It once more laid emphasis on the political side of the nation. The real mission of Israel lay in another direction, viz., as the servant of Jehovah to give the nations a saving knowledge of him. The significance of Israel was past. The universal Jehovah had supplanted the tribal Jahweh. Judaism after the exile represents a new conception of religion which makes it an affair of the individual and not of the group. Such prophetic words as, "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me?" (Amos 9:7), "Have we not all one Father?" (Mal. 2:10, and (of the temple) "A house of prayer for all people" (Isa. 56:7), show that Israel's ultimate mission was supranational. Zionism is an anachronism. We may not turn the hands of the clock back to six when the sun stands at the zenith. The religious basis of Zionism involves the Levitical code and a nationalistic Messiah. Up to the time of the downfall of Jerusalem the Jews could not conceive of a Messiah who was not a nationalist. The chief offense of Jesus lay in his ignoring the claims of the Jewish state. From Bar Cochba to the seventeenth century every manifestation of the Zionistic hope was associated with the claims of a Pseudo-Messiah. "The chief difficulty with Zionism," says Dr. Leon Wolf, "is the religious question. The proposed state would have to be orthodox or secular. If it were orthodox it would have to revive the whole Levitical polity, and in these times it would either pass away through internal chaos or it would so offend the modern political spirit that it would soon extinguish itself from the outside. If it were secular it would not be a Jewish state. The great bulk of its supporters would refuse to live in it, and it would ultimately be abandoned to an outlander population consisting of Hebrew Christians and Christian Millenarians."

Secondly, Zionism is not equitable. There are at most but 80,000 Jews in a total population of 700,000 in Palestine. On what grounds may they justly ask the

Powers to dispossess the land of its present inhabitants? Moreover, the land in question is not the land which the Jews lost through their apostasy. Much water has run under the mill of history since then. "It is no exaggeration to say," says Jastrow, "that the changes in Palestine during the past two millenniums have been as decisive in their character as those that have taken place in the Western Continent since its discovery some 400 years ago." Palestine is now the Holy Land for the pilgrims of three religions. The Jew seeks it as the land of his fathers; the Christian seeks it as the scene of his Lord's ministry; the Mohammedan seeks it as the source of his prophet's inspiration. Palestine is the birth-place of Christianity as well as of Judaism; and, though not the birth-place of Mohammedanism, yet Mohammed fixed upon Jerusalem as the spiritual center of the religion he had founded. Moreover, with the exception of about a century of Crusaders' possession, since 636 A.D. the land has been in Mohammedan possession. Seventy per cent of the population is Mohammedan, and there are twice as many Christians as Jews. The Turkish government made concessions to each of the three bodies represented but did not succeed in abating the animosity among them. A Christian power captured the land during the late war. Already protests have been raised by Mohammedans and Christians in Palestine and Syria against the Zionist program. They clearly perceive that the establishment of a Jewish state would be prejudicial, not only to the present population but also to the adherents to the two faiths which they represent. Historically the Jews are bigoted and illiberal. The constituting elements of the Jews are religion and blood. It would be a strange application of the great principle for which the Great War was waged—the principle that the country belongs to all the population who live in it—were a plan for Palestine to be executed which is based upon the antiquated principle of organizing a state on the accidental factor of birth or creed, or both. Jastrow is undoubtedly right in insisting upon the international-



ization of Palestine. This cannot be done on so narrow a platform as a *Jewish* state.

Thirdly, Zionism is impracticable. There are about 15,000,000 Jews in the world. The scheme would have no significance if the majority, or at least the flower of the race should not return to the land. The majority cannot, for the land could not sustain a third of them; and the flower do not want to go.

Fourthly, Zionism is not commended by its advocates. Besides the Jews and a few non-Jewish sentimentalists the Zionistic platform has for centuries had the enthusiastic support of pre-millenarian Christians. It was they who kept alive the Messianic pretensions of the Jewish impostor Reubeni and his disciple Molcho in the sixteenth century as well as of Manasseh ben Israel in the seventh. Even the apostasy and downfall of Sabbatai Zevi, in the same century, was not sufficient to stop the frenzy of the Millenarians. Theology like politics makes strange bed-fellows. Millenarian Christians advocate Zionism as a step towards the conversion of the Jews—which means their elimination! Millennialism is a *tout de force* theory of the conversion of the world and is as much of an anachronism as Zionism. It is a purely apocalyptic hope based on literalistic hermeneutics. It implies, not a moral, but a miraculous consummation of history. It is a slander on the work of our Lord and the operation of His Spirit. The world which He came to save by His death can be saved only by His fantastic interposition. Fortunately the great body of sane scholarship has been against it. Zionism is condemned by its advocates. We close with the words of a great Jewish scholar, Dr. Leon Wolf: "Modern Zionism is vitiated by its erroneous premises. It is based on the idea that antisemitism is unconquerable and thus the whole movement is artificial. Under the influence of religious toleration and the naturalization laws, nationalities are daily losing their radical character. With the passing away of antisemitism Jewish nationalism will



disappear. If the Jewish people disappear with it, it will be only because either their religious mission in the world has been accomplished or they have proved themselves unworthy of it."

*Theological Seminary,  
Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE II.

WHAT KIND OF A DEMOCRACY WILL MAKE THE  
WORLD SAFE?

BY REV. W. H. FELDMAN.

This is a momentous question in the light of passing events! It presupposes that the safety of the world is dependent on democracy and asks which, in kind, meets the needs. This is true, only if it can be shown that democracy is fundamental and essential or especially adapted by its principles to safeguard such large interests. Let us try to see if this is really true.

In the physical world, we are told that two grand forces predominate; one centripetal, and the other centrifugal—the one draws and the other disperses. So we may liken the two conceptions of government. The one is personal, paternal, autocratic, and dynastic; thus the government of kings, kaisers, czars, oligarchs and bureaucrats may be designated. This has been the chief feature in the world's government throughout the history of the past with but few startling exceptions! They have given us the Genghis Khans, Tamerlanes, Pharaohs, Nebuchadnezzars, Cæsars, Bourbons, Hapsburgs and Hohenzollerns. They have deluged the world with blood and left us the blasted fields of Egypt, Syria, India, and China as well as the crumbling columns of Athens and Rome! They have made the earth a charnel house. Their arrogation of power has meant the desolation of the earth and the destruction of the race! This is "That right divine to govern wrong" that Pope speaks of. But in this bed of political quartz there is seen the thin seam of gold—democracy.

The history of democracy is most astonishing! In ancient times Greece was the chosen soil and it flowered in the days of Pericles. Rome too was a seed-bed for it. Here it was quiescent for two hundred years but burst

forth afresh in the days of the Gracchi; only to end however, with Ceasar; and Ceasarism, says Taxile Delord, is democracy without liberty—a hybrid and a snare!

While this may seem to prove that democracy was a failure, let us never forget that all of the world today as we know it, save as it is the expression of Old and New Testament thought is truly the outgrowth of Greece and Rome; and the part we cherish the most is the period of freedom! Democracy is perennial. We must not think that Ceasar's stunning blow killed it; The Italian republics of the Middle Ages bear ample testimony to the revival of this hope of man.

We must however, make a distinction between the democracies of ancient Greece and Rome as well as the medieval republics of Italy, and the conception that prevails today. Then the idea was confined to the city and was purely local in thought and practice. Furthermore we would at this time state that Switzerland since it is *sui generis* and insular in its development, and not a part of the progressive unfolding of the democratic idea as presented in the order of succession is purposely omitted in the discussion.

Roughly speaking, we may say that modern democracy, in its practical application begins with the United States. But the thought was not by any means new. Its laws are but a revised edition of England's; and its conception of liberty and democracy is decidedly French; for it was in France that Franklin, Paine and Adams lived and labored. Ours is thus a blend of both. Since it is closely related to the French Revolution, it is pertinent to ask what was that event, cause or effect? Was it the result of Louis and "c'est moi l'état," and the building of Versailles, or was it the outcome of Voltaire, Diderot, d'Alembert and the Encyclopedists in general? Or must we assume it to be the fruit of both? That acute critic Montesquieu says, "Republics end in luxury; monarchies with poverty". Landor says, "Democracy is always the work of kings. Ashes which in themselves are sterile, fertilize the land they are cast upon." Was

it France's poverty or the advanced thinking of the day coupled with infidelity that brought about the upheaval and the days that preceeded it? Be it as it may, by all this America was deeply impressed. One needs but read the "Morals of Jesus" by Thomas Jefferson to be convinced! We shall not try to answer it here, for it is not germane to the subject; but we do note this as quite significant, that at least in later times, republics are the fruit of upheavals,—the overthrow of Dom Pedro in Brazil, being the brilliant exception. William H. Seward says, "Democracies are prone to war, and war consumes them". This is true in a measure of the South American republics at least; but hardly of this country. Nevertheless it remains to be seen whether the "kratein" of the "demos" will prove the kratein of the demons! Political philosophers have declared the life of a democracy to be three hundred years. Carlisle said we would last as long as there was free land to give away; we must wait to see what sort of a prophet he makes! Wherever the truth may lie this is certain that the mere name of "democracy" will not prove a Minerva scheme "leaping full-armed from Juno's brain"! We need not hope to have it function simply because we call it democracy! There is no talismanic power connected with it! The whistle won't blow itself! Yea, tho a democratic form is highly desirable, it is also the most difficult form to maintain and operate!

We, as the people of a republic, point to the pages of history with its Louis, Charles, Wilhelm, Abdul Hamid. Ivan the Terrible, Nero the horrible, and James the Impossible—and wonder! As we peruse the pages of Scripture are not the dreariest and saddest of the whole book the chapters of Kings and Chronicles? The oasis (if I may coin a word) exception is only heightened all the more by its failure to achieve anything of consequence! There is Jereboam who made Israel to sin and Ahab the echo of Jezebel etc, etc. With force did crabbed old Swift say, "The example of a vicious prince will corrupt an age; but that of a good one will not re-

form it!" But there is another side to the picture! How does the other man see this whole matter? Rousseau declared, "If there were a people consisting of gods, they would be governed democratically.. So perfect a government is not suitable to men." Was Metternich right when he said, "In Europe democracy is a falsehood"? Lamartine says "At twenty every one is a republican". Is this cynicism or is it a saddened heart of disappointment? If we stop here, nothing better than charge and rebuttal, statement and rejoinder will be forthcoming. Statesmen and historians can be produced who will favor both sides and the subject remains an open one awaiting the fire test of centuries to burn out the dross and present the truth!

We believe that Holy Scripture gives a key to the solution. What was the mind of God in the matter of government? This is self-evident in His dealings with the children of Israel. Beyond any question God intended the Jewish nation to be a theocratic *republic* with *Himself* as its head. He was to be the "All Highest" and none other! When Samuel portrayed the results of choosing a king, he was picturing their folly and reading history in advance—often the role of a prophet. When the shout went up, "God save the king", it would have been far better to have said "God save the people!" When Saul mounted the throne, the Jews started on their march to the mudbanks of the Euphrates! Solomon, in all his glory, was preparing for Titus and the slave-markets of Rome! Plainly did Samuel (I Sam. 8) point out the truth for all ages; namely, that a monarchy is conducted in the interests of the *monarch*—not of the people; or as Leopold of Belgium put it, when he wrote to Victoria of England, "Being a king is the business whereby I make my living". Kingship and self-interest are identical; and self-interest is destined to become narrow, stupid, rapacious, cruel, tyrannical and destructive. Witness the work of forty centuries as ample proof in the case! Thus history, both sacred and profane, pronounces a common judgment on the practice

and principle of the sovereignty of one man or dynasty. This is the inevitable conclusion we are forced to draw; kings cannot make the world safe! The only safety they are concerned about is an asylum in Holland or a chateau in Switzerland! Crowns and princelets were doomed long ago in an eastern palace, in letters of fire, when the living God wrote the words "weighed and found wanting"! Monarchy after five thousand years is a failure. The great question is can democracy accomplish anything. The great Carlisle, so thoroughly versed in history, reaches this conclusion, "Democracy will itself accomplish the salutary universal change from delusive to real, and make a new blessed world for us by and by." This is a stupendous question, but we add at once another question; what kind of a world *will make democracy safe*? This is an unbreakable circle of necessity; you cannot have the one without the other!

Democracy has its own safety to seek! It has 5000 years of monarchism to combat. The ingrained spell of ages is not broken by the blast of a trumpet or the stroke of a pen! Recently we beheld the spectacle of a wholesale overthrow of thrones and many felt the work of kings was undone for good. But we must not forget that the remaining ones will intrench themselves all the more, if it is possible, and covertly work for the restoration of the deposed! And the deposed, though repudiated by their people, will plot and scheme for restoration by every means at their command—and they are many! The Carlists, Bourbons, Jacobites, and Romanoffs with their satellites and retainers are ever busy sapping and mining with their ascendancy in mind. Kings surrender crowns but not claims! Not only so, but wherever snobbishness, class-cleavage, rank, title and caste are fostered, there the monarchist and his agent finds fertile fields to sow his seed of tares to destroy the rights of man. Against this millenium-old kingship-thought the century-old democracy must contend; and oftentimes the very people it is seeking to help are indifferent; yea, at times hostile!

Not only has democracies foes to face, who are without, but it must strive against those that are within its gates! Chiefest of these is the age old disturber of all that is good—human nature! Be this remembered; that pride, cupidity, vanity, personal ambition, licentiousness etc., etc., (and this etc. is hydra-headed) are sworn foes of democracy as well as of God! and will “bore from within” and Samson like pull the building down over their own heads regardless of consequences. Needless to say this will prove as fatal as though the enemy had done it from without. The fall of Paris whether by a “big Bertha” or by the poison of a subsidized propagandist journal would be immaterial to the enemy! The enemy is never choice about means; only ends are considered. To dethrone a king does not depose old king sin and crown prince selfishness of the royal house of original sin. We need but look at the “profiteering”, “gouging”, etc., to see the cancer that is eating at the vitals of the country! Gradually the long list of fraud, and extortion that the government was subjected to, is coming to daylight with all of its sickening situations. War that appealed to the highest and best in man, also appealed to the lowest and worst!

Dangerous as all this is, there is still more. Some one has said the last refuge of a rascal is patriotism; and we would borrow from him and say, the last resort of the self-inflated agitator is democracy! Think of the many phases and aspects that this pseudo-democracy takes? With high sounding words especially that of “the people” he foists on the world his pet “ism” and always claims democracy as the father of his “fad” and expects democracy to sponsor his vagaries, which, when analyzed, usually want to dictate to democracy what course it shall pursue! “In every village there will arise a miscreant to establish the most grinding tyranny by calling himself the people”, says Sir Robert Peel. We need but look to Russia with its Lenine and Trotzky to see the complete fulfillment of this statement. Truly can it be said, that it is wounded in the house of its friends!

Looking at the subject dispassionately, there are to be considered the inherent weaknesses which are coupled with the magnitude of the conception itself! Democracy is dedicated to the conception that government exists by the "consent of the governed". The governed are the government, and as such are directly responsible for its stability and success; with no other animating impulse than devotion and duty. Here the great danger is that the duty of the many becomes the final dereliction of all! With an autocrat to look up to this is unlikely; as it has so often been pointed out. Good subjects do not always make good citizens; there is wide difference between obedience to the law and active cooperation in maintaining the law. Montesquieu says, "The deterioration of a government begins almost always by the decay of its principles". This is most dangerous for democracy since it is national idealism seeking practical application in the affairs of life. It can't afford to be materialistic in motive or individualistic in practice without wrecking the tower of its strength. The moment it ceases to be "by, for, and of the people" it is doomed. To favor class or class-control is doing violence to its principles and signing its own death-warrant. Allow an interjection at this point! We cannot help but point out a glaring danger at Washington at the present moment. We are told that encircling the Capitol at Washington there is a cordon of sixty or more organizations with secretaries and office forces each seeking to protect, not the public, the whole public, but a class or trade, seeking to obtain advantage for a special class through favor or protection, modification of or release from some legislative act. We are thus fast becoming an innumerable host of divided camps with varied and opposing interests; thoroughly calloused and indifferent as far as the general public and body politic are concerned! Think what elements of danger this presents for already overladen democracy! "State rights have been supplanted by "trade rights" and "interests". This situation is symptomatic of organic derangement and will spell destruc-



tion in the end! History is the only guide I know of, and since it is fair to assume that other things being the same, like condition will produce like results, then we are facing a situation which meant the overthrow of the Italian republics of the middle ages! "Humanity is identity" as some one has said. Human nature changes very little. The fierce outbursts of the Athenian market-place can be seen today in the orgies of blood in Nebraska and Missouri; in the burning of courthouses, hanging of mayors and the lynching of negroes. Gold that strangled the ancient republics will prove just as effective today in the Americas! It will not do to delude ourselves by saying we will imitate the virtues of our sires not their vices; the vices come apace and unbidden at that!

Beset by foes without, wounded oftentimes in the house of its friends, with constitutional and structural weaknesses, where shall democracy look for help to make a safe world for democracy and a democracy that will make a safe world.

We know of nothing that history or experience offers other than the *practical application of the principles of Christ*, of whom Lowell said, "Christ was the first true democrat that ever breathed". The omission of that Christ, and His truth, brought all of the fearful sacrifices of the French Revolution to nought; and put a Napoleon on the throne. Mazzini saw this fatal mistake and demanded a place for God in the affairs of state as he says,

"One sole God;  
One sole ruler—his law;  
One sole interpreter of that law—Humanity."

Here we have the sovereignty of God, the finality of His Word and the equality of man. How much this statement resembles the theocratic republic of the Old Testament!

The ordinary method would have been to lay down a fixed definition and develop the thought; but we have de-

ferred till now with a purpose. The commonly accepted idea of democracy is perhaps well stated by Montesquieu. "The love of democracy is that of equality." But Theo. Parker had a much truer conception when he put it thus, "Democracy means not, 'I am as good as you are', but 'you are as good as I am'. There is heaven-wide difference between the two thoughts and we fear that America is not always clear as to the truth. As an abstract statement it is easily said; but the energizing force which shall convert it into a reality is found only in Him who knew neither bond nor free; and is no respecter of persons as blundering Peter found out most painfully. Paul and Onesimus, Matthew and Nicodemus need, all alike, a Saviour! The democracy of sin paves the way for the equality of man in a common Redeemer. But even Parker has not struck the clearest note! Phil. 2:3 says "Let each esteem the other better than themselves". With awe-struck reverence we behold the Son of God take the towel and the basin and become the humblest of servants performing the most menial of tasks!—Lowell's "*first democrat*"—think of it! This vastly outstrips the Boston divine's conception. Thus in precept and practice Christ becomes both inspiration and example.

If democracy is to be made safe for itself and the world, there must be an inward urge sufficiently strong to give an abiding impetus to every act and thought. This social legislation cannot do. Burke remarks, "And having looked to the Government for bread, on the very first scarcity they will turn and bite the hand that fed them." Shameful, no doubt, but true! Rome with its "*panem et circensim*" was possibly in his mind. Legislative investigation will not do it! Newspaper exposes will not do it. These are all negative at best; and no cause is ever strong in the negations it makes. Herein is nothing that seeks another's welfare—to take the towel and the basin! Without controversy it may be stated that Daniel Webster was right when he said "Whatever makes a man a good Christian, makes him a

good citizen." He passes on to others the good he enjoys. Plutarch gives this poem of Iphicrates "My nobility *begins* in me, but yours *ends* in you." The Christian sends his bough over the wall! This attitude alone will give strength to ride the present day agitation of grab and grind. How ridiculous it all appears to the world is well summed up by John Stuart Mill when he sneeringly said, that the heathen by his self-assertion had accomplished as much as the Christian by his self-suppression. But he made the wrong comparison! It is not self-suppression but *service* that marked the Christ and is to mark the Christian. Peace calls for its service as well as war and a nation strong in battle may be weak in peace through lack of it. A Harvard professor called Christianity a religion of slaves. Be it so! yet it tore down the Roman Empire—the greatest political fabric the world ever yet saw. The hope of the democracy lies in the Christian. His faith alone can meet the needs. The Justinian code can't do it; Marxian socialism can't do it with its hell-born trinity: "In religion atheism; in government anarchy; in economy socialism." Christianity alone can save from the snare of plutocracy and the horrors of mob rule. He who spoke the words perdurable "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thy self," and he who declared the abiding power of a new affection in his priceless paean "love is the fulfilling of the law," have given us the secret of a sustaining purpose and whole-hearted devotion. Thus it is that Christianity is not for an age but for the *ages*; not to a chosen few but all. It alone can successfully meet every condition.

It must always be borne in mind that democracy today implies *more* than government control or legislative expression! It involves industry, trade, commerce, education and a thousand other things which we usually sum up as civilization. This makes it very complicated. The reflex action of trade and factory, school and politics, newspaper and science are so complex and far reaching that it is almost impossible to classify and estimate them. But we know that this relation exists. The re-

cent war showed how closely the howitzer in France was bound up with the freight car in America. A commodity like sugar can disturb the state and upset an election. A sensitiveness exists that, at the least disturbance, throws out of balance the whole machinery of government! For such overwhelming thought what philosophy or economy is equal? That unprincipled infidel Frederick the Great of Prussia said, "If I would punish a province I would set philosophers to rule over it." While not agreeing with all he says, yet it is of value from one who ruled. In democracy as well as in religion the hand cannot say to the foot I have no need of thee. Each is bound up in the other in a most complicated way. Take for instance the skyscraper,—it would be impossible without the elevator! One influences the other. A discovery like radium leaps over the walls of science and knocks at the door of medicine; while wireless ties the aeroplane and ships and distant shores to each other. All this multiplies the complexity in an astonishing manner; and since democracy is the expression of our life it too is influenced by it all. Emerson says "government has been a fossil; it must become a plant." It certainly must be a living thing in a democracy where every man is the government. To quote Carlisle "It is not by Mechanism but by Religion, not by Self-interest, but by Loyalty, that men are governed or governable". Then we rightly ask what and where is the place of Protestantism in this great issue?

The following is from de Quincey; "As a Protestant, every mature man, the humblest and the poorest, has the same dignified right over his own opinions and profession of faith that he has over his own hearth\*\*\*\*\* Protestantism it is that has created him into this child and heir of *liberty*; Protestantism it is that has invested him with these unbounded privileges of private judgment, giving him in one moment the sublime power of an autocrat within one solitary conscience; but Protestantism it is that has introduced him to the *most dreadful of responsibilities*." Defoe has this to say about the power

of Protestantism; "It has civilized nations, and reformed the very tempers of its professors; and thus it has carried its own evidence in itself. Never was there a time when Protestantism could so properly enter the lists and do battle for the rights of man! It represents democracy in things religious; as such it is the outspoken foe of the monarchical form of religious thought which arrogates to itself an autocratic headship and its aristocracy of a graduated clergy. It calls no man master save Christ! It makes every man an interpreter of truth. It knows no supremacy save God and His Word. It makes of every man a prince but it knows of no princes in the church. It teaches personal responsibility of man to God and inculcates the same regarding the state. It declares for freedom of conscience to bind it by His holy Word. It denies the right of coercing by inquisition. It believes in meeting error with truth not decrees. It demands unrestricted investigation. It asserts no claims over the state but expects every follower to be wholeheartedly loyal without reservation to a foreign head. For it to say, 'Our Father,' is a call to do foreign mission work, build hospitals and found homes. Its brotherhood is the outgrowth of the great 'elder brother' who is motive as well as model. To it belongs a conspicuous place because of its principles."

One glance at the map of the world will settle where the onward sweep of events is toward liberty; it is in democratic lands! It is but fitting that democratic religion should accompany democratic policies of state! Just as democracy has assumed the leadership in the affairs of the world so Protestantism should put itself at the very head of these lands. Kings and thrones perish where the true idea of a common headship in Christ brings about a genuine brotherhood among men in which service for others is the watchword; and the common good of all is of more concern than the personal advancement of one or a few. This is the democracy that will make for true safety!

*York, Pa.*

## ARTICLE III.

"THE BOOK"<sup>1</sup>

The American Bible Society has asked the Churches of America to observe the last Sunday in November as "Bible Sunday". In a very true sense every Sunday is Bible Sunday. The Book ever exalts the day and the day ever exalts the Book. But it is altogether fitting that one day in the year be especially devoted to this great theme.

When we come to speak of the Bible the question arises, what of the many things that might be said, shall be said? The Book is so many-sided, so vitally and comprehensively related to all the interests of life—individual, social, political, religious—that one scarce knows what line of thought will be most helpful. If we were to say that the Bible is unique, we should be indulging in a trite commonplace. And yet that is the one thing we wish to say and the one thing about which we ask you to think today.

The Bible is unique, in at least, three things. First, in the hold it has taken of the human mind and heart and will. Second, in the character and power it has inspired. Third, in sounding and supplying the deepest needs of the human soul.

First then, as to the hold it has taken of the human mind. Note its supremacy over all other books. We do not say that it is better than other books or that it is best of all books, although both of these propositions are true. But the verdict of the ages is, that it stands *alone*—that it is the incomparable book. We can compare human authorship with human authorship and affirm relative values. But when we compare other books with the Bible we are comparing human authorship with divine

<sup>1</sup> A sermon delivered by A. E. Wagner, D.D., in Christ Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa., November 30, 1919.

authorship and this is not allowable. It is the relation of contrast rather than comparison.

The Bible differs from other books not alone in degree of moral excellence but it essentially differs in origin, authority, power, and atmosphere. And the world recognizes this distinction. When a writer speaks of "The Book", everybody knows what book is meant. Of the millions of books that have been written there is only one that can identify itself with the supreme title, "The Book". Sir Walter Scott was right when in his dying hour he said to Lockhardt, "There is only one book that can be spoken of as The Book".

Here is a fact that not only awakens reverence but demands explanation. An explanation has been attempted. It has been alleged that this impression of supremacy has been created and maintained by organized and continuous propaganda. It has been affirmed that a powerful organization—The Christian Church—has through the ages been making and maintaining this place for the Bible. But when you accept this explanation it in turn needs to be explained. Why did this powerful organization select this particular Book? The book itself did not court such deception nor did it give promise of success to such a propaganda. Why did not this organization take the writings of Plato or Socrates or Marcus Aurelius, or some other great character? Does any one suppose that any organization, however powerful and resourceful, could have created for any other book such a place as that occupied by the Bible? Lincoln's wisdom applies here as elsewhere. "You can fool all of the people sometime, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time".

No! Men have not made a place for the Bible, but the Bible by its incomparable, inherent worth and power and authority, has made for itself a place in the human mind, and neither sophistry nor ingenuity can dislodge it. It is there to stay. It is the rightful Ruler occupying his own throne. It is "The Book" ruling both by divine



right and by human recognition. Long ago it was written: "Forever, O Jehovah, thy word is settled in heaven", and what is "settled in heaven" will sooner or later be established on the earth.

And this is all the more remarkable when we remember the circumstances that have attended and affected it on its human side. This Book is not the work of some master mind who by comprehensive research has gathered into it the combined wisdom of the ages. It consists of sixty-six books, written by some thirty-six writers, living in different countries and in different centuries, with different surroundings and different opportunities and different degrees of culture and refinement. They write of things terrestrial and things celestial; they refer to the past, describe the present and unveil the future; they hear God talk and repeat his words; they give audience to angels and publish their message; they tell of man's fall and his sinful career; they tell of his helpless condition and of the Savior who came to redeem him.

"It is out of date by the calendar but not out of date by its meaning and message. Its different portions were called forth by passing events, and the Book itself is clearly touched by its own times. But, for all that, eternity seems to have lodged itself in its cotemporaneousness".

It contains history and law and doctrine and biography and poetry and prophecy. And the marvelous and significant fact is that this Book written by Kings in their palaces and by Shepherds on the plain, by law-givers in the desert and prophets in their exile, by missionaries on their journeys and prisoners in their dungeons, reaching over the span of sixteen centuries, is one complete harmonious Book, without conflict or contradiction from beginning to end. Diverse in circumstances and form and literary style and mental force, but uniform in spirit and purpose throughout. "Diversity in unity and unity in diversity", the highest possible harmony, saving unity from narrowness and diversity from lawlessness.



But how explain this homogeneous heterogeneity? There is one explanation and only one, and while it involves divine interposition it is paralleled by human experiences that make it easily understood and altogether credible.

You have heard the great orchestra of a hundred or two hundred instruments of every kind and character, played by musicians of different nationalities, of different tastes and temperaments, of different degrees of culture and varying shades of moral character, and yet under the leader's baton the whole heterogeneous company moved and murmured and moaned, now breaking forth into some veritable avalanche of aural splendor and now diminishing into the whispering dreams of peace and rest, like some grand organ under the magic touch of some master hand. How? Why? Because each musician while performing with the skill of his own deft hand, under the impulse of his own personality, was moving in harmony with the theme and the purpose and conception of the composer. Back of all and in all and over all was one and only one moving mind, that of the author of the composition. So with the unity and harmony of the Bible. Back of it and in it and over it was the mind of God. *"Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"*.

With this explanation both the harmony and the unsurpassed power of the Bible are easily understood; but with any other explanation they are inexplicable. If the Bible is simply a human composition, each writer expressing his own thought, why should men of this advanced age turn to it for light or help. If it is of man then man with the superior advantages of the present can not only equal but supercede it.

Let us be clear on this. The Bible claims to be divine in origin, authority and power. The sceptic maintains that it is simply human in origin, and therefore only human in authority and power. It is one or it is the other. The line of distinction is definite. Either God inspired it or man unaided produced it. If we believe that God,

through holy men led by his will, wrote it, then its claims and conclusions, and its hold upon humanity are easily understood and readily accepted. But if it is only the work of man then are we met by the challenge which Mr. Bryan has laid down for the skeptic. It is this. "Atheists and Materialists declare that the Bible is merely the work of man. Let them then produce its equal. Let them call the best of their school to be found among the graduates of universities, as many as they please and from every land. Let the members of this select group use every instrumentality that is employed in modern civilization, and when they have exhausted every source let them embody the results in a book and offer it to the world as a substitute for this Bible of ours".

The challenge is fair. The sceptic must meet it or by his refusal confess his inability. If men in the ancient past, law-givers schooled in the desert, shepherds trained in the pasture field, prophets in their exile and prisoners in their dungeons, unaided from above could write such a book as our Bible, the culture of this 20th century, with its immeasurable advantages cannot only equal but vastly surpass our Bible.

But you know and they know it is impossible. Men created in the image of God, men whose souls are stirred by the unquenchable longings for immortal life will never rest their hopes on a man-made book.

Man-made books are read for a day and then pass into history or more likely into oblivion. A book on science twenty-five years old is as likely to be a relic as a revelation, "not a surveyor's corner stone marking a fixed boundary but rather a chainman's peg indicating the distance measured". "Homer is antiquated and Chaucer is not only old but obsolete; but the harp of David's poesy echoing from the sunny slopes of Bethlehem is as vibrant as ever". "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want", sounded from that harp three thousand years ago and in the three milleniums that have followed there has been scarce a single minute, night or day, in which some lisping child, or some struggling man or some waiting

saint has not solaced his soul with its sweet assurance of divine care and paternal love. And as Henry Ward Beecher has said: "Nor is its work done. It will go singing to your children and my children and to their children, through all the generations of time; nor will it fold its wings till the last pilgrim is safe and time ended, and then it shall fly back to the bosom of God, whence it issued, and sound on, mingled with all those sounds of celestial joy which make heaven musical forever". When "new thought" or "the advanced culture of the twentieth century" can duplicate the twenty-third psalm, or quench the soul's longing for its assurance, it will then be time enough to consider a human substitute for a divine Book.

That the Bible stands alone in the hold it has taken of the human mind is well established. Men have contested the fact and sought to annul its conclusions, but in vain. The destructive critic has tried to invalidate its authority and cut out the heart of its message. But in increasing number men bow before its authority and crave its comfort. Bad men are against it because it is against them. Jehoiakim thought to get rid of certain portions that condemned him by putting his penknife through the scroll and casting the mutilated leaves into the fire place. But scarce had these leaves turned to ashes when Baruch was re-writing the prophecy with additional condemnations. Men have burned the Bible to get rid of its judgments, but the judgments of God are established forever and everywhere.

"If I ascend up into heaven,  
thou art there:  
If I make my bed in Sheol, behold,  
thou art there.  
If I take the wings of the morning,  
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;  
Even there shall thy hand lead me,  
And thy right hand shall hold me.  
If I say, surely the darkness shall overwhelm me,

And the light about me shall be night;  
Even the darkness hideth not from thee,  
But the night shineth as the day;  
The darkness and the light are both alike to thee".

Psalm 139: 8-12.

Men have been burned because of their faith in the Bible but the pitiless flames of the burning pyre have thrown their dying testimony upon the screen of subsequent ages that men might read it forever.

This Book has taken such hold of the human mind that it cannot be destroyed by criticism, or "culture", or persecution, or neglect. It is born of God and abideth forever. The world has at least one indestructible Book.

One evening at a dinner where a number of scholars were gathered, the question was raised, If at the close of the third century every copy of the New Testament should have been burned could it have been reproduced from the writings of those first three centuries. Sir David Dalrymple took up the task of answering the question and at the end of two months had found and indexed nearly every verse in the New Testament out of the writings of those centuries and was satisfied that further search would supply the others.

If today every copy of the Bible in the world were burned, before tomorrow's sunset the Book complete could be reproduced from other books. And if every library and every book in the world were burned you could reproduce the fundamental facts of the Bible from the world of art, so largely have the truths and the events and the characters thereof been painted on canvas, sculptured in marble, cast in bronze and graven in steel. And if every art gallery should this day be destroyed, you could reproduce the vital and fundamental truths of the Book in our great musical conservatories, in the hymns and anthems and oratorios that have been singing through the ages. In one oratorio alone, Handel's great masterpiece, "The Messiah", is a gospel sufficient to re-

deem a lost world. And if every Bible and every library and every art gallery and every musical conservatory were destroyed you would yet have your Bible undimmed, unscathed and imperishable in the memory of the minds of a countless host of believers who have hid the word of God in their hearts. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away".

Beyond all possibility of doubt "The Book" is unique in the hold it has taken of the human mind and heart.

Let us pass now to our second proposition, namely, the Bible is unique in that which it inspires and awakens in human lives.

A book which inspires men need not be much concerned about the fact of its own inspiration. On the other hand an inspired book that does not inspire will have difficulty in establishing its claim. The teacher laid down the norm of all valuations: "By their fruits ye shall know them".

That the Bible is a book of power is evidenced in the indisputable fact that it makes strong men, strong institutions, strong governments. As has been truly said: "The world is big, yet is measurably ruled by one Book. The miracle is this: That a very ancient Book rules a very modern world". William E. Gladstone, himself perhaps the strongest single personal force in the British Empire in the 19th century said that in a public career reaching over sixty years he had personally known sixty of the leading men of his age and that almost without exception they had received the inspiration of their strength and purpose from the Bible.

Theodore Roosevelt said: "Almost every man who by his life-work added to the sum of human achievement of which the race is proud, of which our people are proud, based his life-work largely upon the teachings of the Bible. The social fabric has no surer foundation than the Bible".

Daniel Webster said: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper, but if we and our posterity neglect its in-

structions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury our glory in profound obscurity".

Ulysses S. Grant said: "Hold fast to the Bible as the sheet anchor of your liberties; write its precepts on your hearts, and practice them in your lives. To the influence of this Book we are indebted for the progress made in civilization; and to this we must look as our guide in the future".

These are the opinions of some of the wisest men of our national history and to the weight of their opinions is added the greater weight of indisputable facts. With due appreciation of our national weaknesses it can be said that ours is the strongest and most influential government on earth. Strong not alone in material resource and geographical dimension but strong in those intellectual and moral and social and political virtues which give stability and dignity to our institutions, and conspire to awaken the respect and confidence of other peoples. This fact must be linked to another. With due sense of our national imperfections; and they are many, it can nevertheless be said that no nation has given to the Bible a greater or more genuine reverence or been more vitally influenced by its teachings.

It is "The Book" in the home, in the school, in the courts of justice, in the temple of state. The Chief Magistrate of this nation seals his solemn oath by kissing its sacred page. Nor is this a mere formal ceremonialism to adorn and dignify a great occasion. It is as deep as the life of the nation and prophetic of her destiny. This reverent act of the Chief Magistrate symbolizes the faith of the nation over which he is to preside.

Between this strongest nation and this strongest Book there is a relation the significance of which cannot be evaded and which must not be obscured. Either this nation being strong has chosen this Book for its guidance, or, it has become strong because this Book has trained and developed it. If the former, it is significant; it reveals the *wisdom* of the nation. If the latter, it is

more significant; it reveals the *power* of the Book. There are those who believe the latter is the truth. When Andrew Jackson was asked to explain the greatness of this nation he said: "The Bible is the rock upon which this Republic rests". Ex-ambassador Joseph Choate in a remarkable address before the British and Foreign Bible Society on the occasion of its Centenary anniversary said: "The Pilgrim Fathers brought to the shores of New England from the shores of Old England one possession of permanent value. And that wonderful possession was the King James Bible. It was their only readable book. It was the ark of their covenant. Upon it they built the new State, later to become the new Republic".

Nor is this the only great nation that has drawn its strength from divine sources. When India sent representatives to London to learn the source of England's power, the good Queen Victoria reverently holding the Bible before them said: "Here is the secret of England's greatness". Great nations must be guided and inspired by the great Book. No nation can be permanently great without it. If you ask for proof, our answer is the map of the world and history of nations.

We have not time to set forth what the Bible inspires and awakens in the individual. It is an experience so common that it needs no elucidation. It furnishes the missionary of the cross not alone with a message but equally with a motive and a stimulus sufficient to sublimize him for the most difficult, the most heroic, the most far-reaching service that can engage the energies of mortal man. It inspires the martyr with a courage and a faith which enable him to give not only all he *has* but all he *is* to the cause of truth. It inspires the soldier with a vision of duty that makes sacrifice a privilege rather than an ordeal. Let Arthur Guy Empey speak of the soldier's attitude and the soldier's support: "American people can supply our boys with rifles, bayonets and munitions of war, but these alone cannot win; the spirit must be there, also—the kind of spirit which will make



a soldier go over the top to win, regardless of his own danger. The spirit of right is the mightiest of all. A soldier carrying a testament in his pocket knows that he is right—knows that God is with him, and the terrors and dangers of No-Man's Land are forgotten. Who can ask a more powerful ally than God".

Yes! This Book which has gained the attention of the human mind as no other book has, has also inspired and awakened the human heart as no other book has.

Let us pass now to our third proposition, namely, that the Bible is unique in sounding and supplying the needs of the human soul. Coleridge believed the Bible was divine because it "found him at his deepest depths".

But how can the Bible do this and why can it reach depths that other books cannot sound? Why does the key unlock the door? Because it was made for that particular lock by one who knew the exact character and nature of the lock. So the Bible unlocks the soul because it was made for the soul by One who understands absolutely the character and needs of the soul.

That the Bible is the golden key that unlocks the human heart is not a mere theological theory but a demonstrated fact of human experience. It has unlocked the soul to a sense and acquisition of power. That the Bible nations of the earth are the nations of commanding power and influence and dominion, is a fact too well known to require any proof.

It is the golden key that has unlocked the human intellect to truth, the development of science and the march of progress. "The entrance of thy word giveth light". It is true you will find some truth and some science in the heathen world. But if you were to eliminate from the intellectual progress of the world all that has come directly or indirectly from the word of God, you would have a world whose identity the most discerning eye could not discover. It will not do to point to Greece and Rome as examples of what the race can do without divine guidance. That which was best in these nations was but the indirect influence—the reflected, the borrow-



ed light—that shone from the divine Mind. These nations appropriated divine blessings without recognizing the source or appreciating the gift.

The Bible is the golden key that has unlocked genius to the consciousness of its birthright and the glory of its power. Eliminate from the world of art all that has been inspired by the divine idea—all that has been awakened by Bible truth, Bible characters and Bible history and while you would have something left you would have robbed it of its richest treasures. Such an elimination would despoil the realm of art of its plenitude of glory and its amplitude of vision. Eliminate from art the divine idea and Michael Angelo will have no "Moses" in marble and no vision of "The Last Judgment" in the Sistine Chapel. Raphael would have on canvas no "Madonna" and no "Transfiguration". Handel would have no "The Messiah". John Milton would have no "Paradise Lost". And like Rachael weeping for her children, an admiring world would not be comforted.

What are some of the soul's deep needs? First of all the soul needs self-discovery, self-realization. It needs to know something about itself. There are certain great questions which the soul goes on asking from age to age—questions which it has a right to have answered. What am I? Whence came I? What am I here for? Whither am I going? What book or books can satisfactorily or adequately answer these profound interrogations? Just one!

Man is conscious not only of the power of sin but of its guilt. What book or books can show him the way of victory? Just one! Joseph Cook as he stood in the Congress of Religions at the time of the Chicago Exposition, facing the representatives of every religion, every ethical system, every cult on the face of the earth said: "Gentlemen which of you represents a religion that can take away the stain from Lady Macbeth's hand?" And there was no response to his strategic challenge. When the hushed silence became almost oppressive the great champion quietly but triumphantly said: "Our Holy Re-

ligion can wash away that stain". Is it too much to affirm that our Bible is unique in supplying the deep needs of the soul?

Man is often called upon to undergo trying and torturing ordeals. Where shall he look at such times? The American Bible Society in one of its leaflets tells the pathetic story of a young soldier seriously wounded in a French hospital. The surgeon looked him over, shook his head and said: "There is no use trying to do anything for him; he is all shot to pieces". The lad had his eyes closed, but heard what the surgeon said. He opened his eyes and turned to a soldier standing near by and said: "Get me the little book out of the knapsack". The soldier gave it to him. He read for a little while—gave it back to the attendant and turning to the surgeon said: "I am ready for you now, doctor". The surgeon proceeded and the boy stood the operation wonderfully. The surgeon was greatly surprised and after it was all over asked the friend the name of the book that had brought the miracle. The soldier replied: "It was a New Testament". Is it too much to say the Bible is unique?

I want to close with a quotation from "The Bible and Life" by Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes. "The Gideons have been placing Bibles in the hotels of America. Travelers seldom go to their rooms without seeing upon the table a copy of the Book. The organization that has done this good work often receives accounts anonymous or otherwise, of the help given by the Bibles it supplies. Here is a letter received from a young woman.

"Perhaps a word will help you to realize that the little "Good Book" on the table in a lonely hotel room helps some. Last night, after fighting, the fight that any young woman with any appearance fights, I found myself in Chicago at this hotel. I had papers, magazines, books, and other reading matter, but for a joke—yes, joke—I picked up the Bible. It fell open at the seventieth psalm. Can you imagine the impression it made on me? I read it again and again. Needless to say, it helped and I feel better, happier, and not so much alone".

Picture the full circumstances, and we may feel that the help went deeper and wrought more than this letter indicates. If this young woman was at the beginning of that dreadful path of death that invites careless travelers, how much must these ancient words, so graciously modern, have meant to her? "Make haste, O God, to deliver me; make haste to help me, O Lord. Let them be ashamed and confounded that seek after my soul; let them be turned backward, and put to confusion, that desire my hurt. Let them be turned back for a reward of their shame that say, Aha, Aha. \* \* \* But I am poor and needy; make haste unto me, O God; thou art my help and my deliverer; O Lord, make no tarrying."

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE IV.

CONSERVATION IN MATTERS PERTAINING TO  
THE CHURCH.

BY L. FRANKLIN GRUBER, D.D.

The term *conservation* is an old and honored one. For a number of decades it has been used to express the scientific fact, that the sum of all the various forms of energy, as well as the total mass of matter, in the universe, is apparently a constant quantity. In that specific sense it has, however, been confined virtually to scientific literature. But it has a wider and more general meaning. And if words in themselves are empty vessels that must be filled with ideas, then this word *conservation* may be said of late years to have received greater fulness than it enjoyed before. A little upward of a decade ago, constructive statesmen of large vision called upon the country to take proper steps to conserve its various natural resources. President Roosevelt accordingly appointed (June 8, 1918) what is known as the *National Conservation Commission* to make an inventory of these resources. The *American Conservation Conference*, composed of eminent men from all parts, discussed the whole problem of conservation of mineral deposits, waterfalls, etc., with great enthusiasm. And well might the country be aroused to the need of such conservation when the ruthless destroyer is so openly at work at the resources that should form part of our national wealth for the future.

The above-mentioned movement toward conservation seems almost to have been prophetic of that still wider application of this term during the Great War. Surely, as a nation we learned to conserve as never before. The amount of waste in our nation's life, both private and public, had been enormous. But by a proper attention to the possibilities of conservation we soon helped to

feed half of Europe, in addition to supplying our own actual needs. Not only in the kitchen and in the workshop, but also on the farm and in the railroad world, and in other spheres of what might be called the public utilities of the land, has conservation become a word to be conjured with. Express Companies and their offices were consolidated to reduce the number of employees and the overhead expenses in general to a minimum. Indeed, co-operation, so as to conserve material resources and both personal and physical energy, is in the air. And while a great amount of needless overlapping of industrial machinery that could be reduced or partially eliminated, still exists, our docile country has learned her lessons in conservation and home economy tolerably well.

What has thus made its telling appeal to the home and to the State, is also beginning to move the Church. She, too, is still far from perfect in her organization to fight the great battle of truth against error, of righteousness against evil. The need of conservation and of greater constructive statesmanship and generalship in the Church, should be apparent to every interested observer. She has great treasures to guard and great problems to solve, if, in her ceaseless warfare, she would win America and the world for Christ.

There are two phases to the subject we are considering, which might be spoken of as the material and the spiritual, both of which we may study with profit.

#### CONSERVATION ON THE MATERIAL SIDE.

Some years ago, in an address in Binghamton, New York, Dr. Melancthon Woolsey Stryker, President of Hamilton College and one of the most eminent men in the American Presbyterian Church, was reported to have declared that it would be for the better interests of Protestantism in Central New York to have five hundred churches burned to the ground. It was a very

exaggerated, and perhaps somewhat offensive, form of giving expression to a truth long felt by many people. His statement certainly seems to have some justification from an unfortunate condition in Reformed Protestantism. The disintegrations of that wing of the Church into its multitude of sects and sectlets, has led to a sad state of ecclesiastical competition, at once the subject of criticism on the part of Rome and of derision on the part of the world. And in many cases there is but little better reason for separate existence than some small difference of outward form, oftentimes chiefly in government, and perhaps some almost microscopic difference in doctrine or polity, in most cases non-fundamental. In many a town of half a thousand people, with its sparsely settled surrounding country, there may be found a half dozen or more different Reformed churches, Methodist and Evangelical, Presbyterian and Congregationalist, Baptist and Christian or Disciples, etc., while the people of the town may be predominantly of one or two of these persuasions. Yet all these work to draw the people unto themselves so as to be the better able to eke out their half-dying existence, while the population might be able adequately to support only two or at the most three churches, which should be established upon the basis of the predominating denominational elements.

But, from a Lutheran point of view, perhaps an even sadder picture presents itself where, in towns with populations almost entirely Lutheran, we sometimes find that Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterian, Episcopalians, and perhaps several of the lesser denominations, are all trying to gain a foothold by proselyting among these Lutherans, especially among the young people, and sometimes even with very questionable methods. Such a field should, in accordance with good practical business methods, be left virtually intact to the great mother church of the Reformation. Some of the denominations in our large centers of population have organized agencies constantly at work, often innocently, but at times perhaps wilfully, undermining the

loyalty and faith of unsuspecting Lutherans, and often with the insidious heresy that one Church is as good as another. Surely, the challenge of Rome and the charge of the world have some foundation in actual fact when such conditions prevail. Rome says that Protestantism is self-destructive in that its various divisions cut one another's throats; and the world looks on and sneeringly says, "Better outside than inside a Church of such dissensions, for who is right and whom can we believe, seeing that the components of Christianity disagree and are at variance and war with one another?" But who can justify the sending of tens of thousands of dollars, by certain denominations, to countries of Europe, especially Norway and Sweden, to convert (?) Lutheran Christians? Surely, that looks like the little girl trying to teach her mother the art of nursing. Of course, it will be contended that ideal religious conditions do not everywhere prevail. And this is unfortunately true; but it is true also within the bounds of those very denominations themselves. And, of course, no one would defend religious conditions among the thousand millions of the non-Christian world! Then why not first endeavor to convert those two-thirds of the world for Christ, before attempting to proselyte from other *Christian* bodies within the pale of *Western* civilization? Surely, the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light! Who ever heard of a house or a kingdom, divided against itself, that succeeded! And in the application of this principle the Church of our blessed Lord is no exception.

While the Lutheran Church is by no means free from the great need of conservation, as we shall see, nor altogether free from guilt, we believe that she has seldom been *grossly* guilty in this respect with reference to the denominations. She indeed strives to keep her people true to their faith; and when any considerable numbers of her faith are so located as to need a church of their own, she strives to follow them with her ministrations. But where the population is non-Lutheran Protestant,



she believes it to be the duty first of some Reformed denomination to minister to them. At least she has not tried in such cases to undo the legitimate work of others; but she rejoices in their every success and blessing. She does not pretend to be the whole Church nor has she ever presumed to unchurch others; but she stands firm in her conviction that she has first claim to her own legitimate children, and hence first right and duty to care for them.

Although the Lutheran Church thus has quite a clean record as to her attitude toward the denominations more properly so called, the records of her various branches are by no means as clean with reference to one another. Here she could with much profit apply the principle of conservation. It is true that the different nationalities of our great Church, scattered throughout the same territory, especially in our large cities—many of whom still need to be ministered to in their native tongues—have necessitated the planting of Lutheran churches of different languages upon the same territory. But even here an outlook into the future is necessary, which has not generally been taken. These churches will in the course of time inevitably have to become at least bilingual, and in most cases altogether English-speaking. They should therefore be so distributed, even while different in language, as not to hamper one another's work when they come to use the same American tongue. And there is hardly a city of any considerable size in which there are not glaring cases where ecclesiastical statesmanship in the selecting of such church sites has not been wanting. But to plant Lutheran churches of the same language, whatever that language may be, right under one another's shadow, simply because of difference of Synods, is not only unbrotherly and unLutheran, but to all outward seeming unChristian. To pretend that this is necessary because some of the people are of Swedish, Norwegian, German, or some other blood, as the case may be, and that therefore they have to be housed by Swedish, Norwegian, German or some other Synod, rather than by a distinctively English Synod, or even by

another Synod doing English work, is to put blood above faith, quite contrary to the teaching of the inspired apostle that in Christ Jesus there is "neither Jew nor Greek", but that all are *one* in Him. There is no such thing as Norwegian-English, Swedish-English, German-English, etc., for as our people become Americanized distinctions of blood should be ignored in the broader unity of the new cosmopolitan race and its one American language. The American race is greater than any of its component nationalities, as America is greater than any of its States; and so the Lutheran Church is greater than any of its Synods. The *faith* should thus ever be conserved, if it be the one true faith. Faith, not blood, substance not form, should be our Church's basis of unity, just as in dealing with spiritual rather than material entities she ever exalts the spiritual above the material, the soul above the body.

In the light of what has thus far been said, it should therefore not be surprising to find a statement like that of Dr. Stryker hailed by some classes with enthusiastic approval and applause. But it all depends upon whose churches should first be burned. One could suppose that the adherents of one denomination might say, "Let the other churches first be destroyed"; and the adherents of other denominations might be supposed to say the same words. And perhaps in some sections, members of several churches might say in unison, "Let the Lutheran Church or churches be burned first". And might there not be Lutherans guilty of the same uncharitable thought toward others? But whatever the guilt involved in such a thought, no one who seriously reflects will deny that there certainly is need of conservation here; for untold amounts of money and energy are next to wasted in such overlappings and competitions of the various denominations, and of churches belonging to the same denomination. It is therefore refreshing to see a rapid development of sentiment against all such unbusinesslike methods in the Church. Already there is a

growing tendency to consolidate churches rather than to multiply centers. Within the Methodist, Presbyterian, and other denominations, consolidations are of frequent occurrence. And within our own denomination such consolidations are by no means rare. Moreover, one of the principles of the *Interchurch World Movement* is to help to avoid all duplication of energy, so far as possible, in the future, both at home and abroad. A survey of the home fields, as well as one of the foreign fields, is being arranged for and conducted, so as to enable the whole of co-operative Protestantism to do the most for the world's evangelization with a minimum expenditure of money and energy. And although the Lutheran Church is not as such *organically* in this great co-operative movement, we must surely look with favor upon such an application of business principles to the business of the Kingdom. There is a cry of a shortage in the ranks of the Christian ministry in almost every branch of the Church—a shortage that is rapidly tending to become even more pronounced—as there is a cry for more and more money in these times of costly merchandise or of a cheaper dollar. And much of the ministerial shortage, as well as of financial shortage, can and will undoubtedly be overcome by a proper application of the principles of conservation referred to above. Surely, when the cry of the non-Christian world, still consisting of two-thirds of the human race, is louder and more compelling than ever before, the denominations in the home lands should not duplicate one another's efforts among a population which surely in many sections is adequately supplied with the opportunities for obtaining the bread of life, and is therefore wholly without excuse. The slogan of the Church should more and more become, "The Gospel of salvation for *all* people". The apostles would have loved to tarry in *Jerusalem*, had not Providence overruled that they should go *elsewhere*; and their going elsewhere, as a result even of persecution, meant Europe, and later on America, for Christ. So the Church of this twentieth century must also put greater

stress upon the bringing of the Gospel to those who have *not yet learned to know* the true God. And it need hardly be added that with the mixture of the various races of the world, it must become apparent that unless the present Christian nations Christianize the non-Christian world, it will gradually paganize Western civilization.

But, speaking of our own Church more specifically, not only on the part of the various Synods in their relations to one another is conservation necessary, but also on the part of the individual Synods with reference to themselves and the Church's *greater* interests. A Synod should do all it legitimately can do to grow larger and stronger and to conserve itself and its interests, and to that end concentration of its efforts and resources is essential. But surely no Synod should so concentrate itself upon any favored spot as to neglect other places within its bounds that may be equally important. And this is always worth considering where there is a duplication of missionary efforts as the result of the *overlapping of Synods*. Here unnecessary multiplication of centers of operation tends to cripple already established work. And, of course, the stronger a congregation is the more it can accomplish both at home and abroad, because overhead local expenses are relatively reduced with increase in membership. Of this fact there are abundant illustrations in some of our more representative churches, especially in large cities. This is in line with good modern business methods. It insures better local equipment, as well as greater relative ability for the interests of the Church at large. And, as already intimated, there are interests that are greater than the interests of any one Synod, even as the Lutheran Church is greater than any Synod. Not to look beyond its own horizon is to become narrow in vision, while to look with a larger outlook beyond its own bounds not only enlarges and broadens its general vision but also makes possible a clearer vision at home. It has been well said, "The light that shines farthest shines brightest nearer home".

There is that scattereth and still increaseth. The great problem of how to care for out *whole* scattered polyglot Lutheran population in this great American camping-ground of the nations, and the still *greater* problem of our Church's responsibility for the evangelization of the multitudinous millions of the benighted *non-Christian* nations, need solution in terms of greater potential than those of a mere local organization. While the life or status of the Church is in a sense dependent upon that of its Synods, it is also conversely true that the life and condition of the Synods are dependent upon the great throbbing pulse-beats of the greater life and status of the whole Church. Therefore the conservation of the Synod for the future is largely dependent upon the Synod's co-operation in the propagation and strengthening of the greater work of the *whole* Church, especially so along home and foreign missionary lines.

Then, too, the attitude of some Synods (or general bodies) toward others in refusing to transfer members to any churches but those belonging to their own bodies, is clean contrary to true conservation. To refuse to transfer members to another Synod, when requested, especially when one's own Synod has no congregation in or near the place, is to open the door for such members to go into some other denomination or sect, or even into the world. Here to try to save a member to the Synod is to lose him for the Lutheran Church to a sect or to the world. We could recite many concrete cases if time and space permitted. Then, too, to try to hold members in the congregation just as long as possible only to get their little contributions, after they have found a permanent home in another city or state, is the very opposite of conservation. When it is impossible for such to attend the services in their erstwhile home congregations, such action is the surest way to wean them away from the Church of their first love, or often from Christianity altogether. To make the excuse that these can simply attend some Lutheran Church there while still retaining their former membership, is, to say the least,

selfish, and surely destructive to such members' religious interests and therefore to the interests of the Church. And yet what city pastor has not come across many such cases? Indeed, a great percentage of our practically unchurched Lutherans excuse themselves by saying that they still retain their membership in the congregation of some other city, town, or country district. And then trusting in such straw-connection, which often does not have even any real existence in fact, they are lulled to a self-satisfying sleep whose constant dream is that they are members of a church, and therefore of the Kingdom, and somehow all right with the Lord both in life and in death. In some sections of our country such are spoken of as grave-yard members, because when they die they look to that church by a Christian burial to give them a viaticum for heaven and to open its adjoining free-for-all grave-yard for the body's final resting place. No, it is every pastor's duty, like a good shepherd, to follow those members of his flock that move elsewhere and to help to lead them to new pastures green. He should not only encourage them at once to seek out a church of their own faith—own Synod, if possible—and to become active there, but he should notify the pastor of the church nearest them of their removal thither so as to have him call upon them and welcome them into his church and among his people. A systematic plan to this end might with much profit, in the interests of religious and ecclesiastical conservation, be adopted by the various Synods, and with mutual co-operation by the general bodies, and ultimately by the Church as a whole.

But we must not overlook the need of conservation in its special application to the laborers of the Church, the ministry and the laity. In order to render service or do aggressive work the Church must have servants or workers. Rightly to conserve our Church and her manifold interests she must have and develop *conservers*. But we have no space to set forth plans how best to recruit the Gospel ministry and to develop our laity, except simply to point out this imperative need, if we

would conserve and propagate our glorious Church. To help every layman and laywoman to realize his or her share of this responsibility and to do their part in this great work, and to get the ministry to see the untold latent energy and possibilities in an active laity and to transmute this potential energy into mighty kinetic energy which is its equivalent, is to take a long step toward that conservation upon which not only the future of our Church depends, but under God even the future of His very Kingdom among men and the victory of righteousness and truth against unrighteousness and error. The Church should not only with great wisdom and tact choose out from among its young men such as might have the appropriate qualifications for the Gospel ministry, but it should implore the great Head of the Church so to direct their minds and hearts as to become laborers in the vineyard. To pray the Lord of the harvest that He would send forth laborers into His harvest, is in accordance with the Savior's express direction. But, surely, it is not necessary to add that, while there is a *proper* method of recruiting the ministry, there is also an *improper* method. Young men should be intelligently directed, but they should not be coerced or urged overmuch against their wills. On this point oftentimes fond parents, with the co-operation of well-meaning pastors, undoubtedly err, and the result often is a sad misfit in the high office to which men have been led against their will. Thus often a good business man is spoiled to make an unfitted and therefore unhappy or unsatisfied minister. We are reminded of an old seller of patent medicines some years ago, whose brother was a highly respected and successful minister of the Gospel. As sons of a learned and capable pastor, they were both meant by the parents to be consecrated to the work of the Gospel ministry. The parents' fondest dreams were realized in the one son; but the other son, after completing a part of his preparation, left school and manfully faced the issues of life thus set before him. And when considerably past middle life, he used to say



that he too had "been cut out for a preacher", but that "the devil stole the pattern". Sacrilegious as the words may seem, there was a frankness about his statement, and a principle underlying it, that were not wholly without some lesson. It was most assuredly better in his case never to have entered the holy office than to have entered it unsuited, unsatisfied, and perhaps sooner or later to leave it for secular work, to the astonishment of the Church and the reproach of the world. Surely, if it be true that "He also serves who only stands and waits", as Milton, deprived of his sight, could trustfully sing, then it is also true that a young man can serve his Lord in a real sense even in a secular calling and as a consecrated layman, if he feels that he has no divine call to the ministry or that he lacks certain necessary qualifications of head and heart. And this psychological fact both parents and pastors must not ignore. The Lord will always have His witnesses, and the Church must act with *much wisdom* in this important work of religious conservation.

There is another phase to the conservation of the individual in the Church, especially the individual pastor and professor. Our Church has often made the mistake of overworking, I had almost said abusing or wasting the powers of, some of its men, especially its ablest. Witness the case of the sainted Dr. Krauth, with his double professorship, literary activity, both private and editorial, defensive and offensive polemicism against the attacks from without, as well as against some from within, activity in constructive Church statesmanship and executive headship, and other more general duties, followed by what to many might have seemed an untimely death. What even greater and more permanent literary monuments he might have left to his Church and to the world if he had been less hampered by a multiplicity of duties, many of which might have been performed by others, both to their own development and to the discovery by the Church of perhaps otherwise unknown giant abilities, and consequently greater ultimate

good to the Church! Thus might we speak of other past, and perhaps even present, leaders in our great Church. It is not as if such men were not qualified to do all these things, especially if taken in their turn, but that their accumulated responsibility became too great to enable them to render other even more permanent service along literary and other lines, while other men might have been entrusted with parts of these responsibilities and thus have developed into greater usefulness than was otherwise even discovered. Indeed, only too often had great ability to be discovered to our Church by eminent individuals and worthy agencies not of our communion, simply because it had been overlooked by ourselves in focusing our eyes rather too steadily upon a few favorite leaders. Here, too, "Full many a flower is born to blush unseen and waste its sweetness on the desert air." May the above not be partially true of such eminent men as Hilprecht and Pick?

As some one has perhaps not altogether untruthfully said, it seems, when men of more than ordinary ability are discovered, that at first efforts were even made to keep them in the background or in obscurity. And this is what might, of course, be expected in the *political* world. But when once such men have made themselves felt, by the sheer force of their own initiative and momentum, so that their place can no longer be disputed, they are often so burdened with duties, that it may almost seem to the disinterested outside world like some form of hero worship. Is it not true that the American Lutheran Church is guilty of leaving the impression upon the non-Lutheran theological world that she has had only about one great American scholar and theologian of first rank, namely, Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth; while Mann, the Schaeffers, and others, not to speak of men like the eminent Dr. Walther and many others in other bodies, are hardly heard of outside our own Church? It is like having a few men do all the work on all the committees without associating with

them others perhaps younger in years and experience, for exercise and training.

The Church should learn well her lesson, that "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit", and that "to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal". To one is given "the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge according to the same Spirit". Indeed, that whole twelfth chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians bears upon this part of our subject and is full of instruction to the Church even in this twentieth century. The Church must not expect all God's gifts to be of one kind or to be centered in one or a few individuals, nor must men of different gifts disparage one another's talents and work. The pastor, the professor, the secretary of a distinctive ecclesiastical activity, or the missionary upon the home or foreign field, must not look upon his own work as alone of significance, nor must he lightly regard the work in other churchly spheres of activity. But all should rejoice in any real contribution of every other worker in the Kingdom, whatever the nature of that contribution may be. And thus in the united service of all God's servants, to which each one has contributed his peculiar part, the Lord will be glorified and every detail of His Kingdom receive its requisite attention. All should feel that it is not what each individual can do *alone*, but what all can do *working together* according to their *different* talents, however *different* may be their methods of work or relatively important their various contributions to the great cause of the Lord. It is God's method in the kingdom of nature to operate through a *variety* of secondary causes, from the relatively most insignificant to those of cosmic importance, from electron to star. And yet all these various agencies of operation are made to work together with ineffable harmony for the conduct of the universal whole. Well nigh infinite variety down to infinitesimal details is thus bound together into a well nigh infinite cosmic unity as the glorious workmanship of the one infinite God. And

what is true of God's *modus operandi* in the kingdom of nature is unmistakably meant to be true also in the kingdom of grace, as is so beautifully set forth in the chapter from St. Paul's Epistle already cited. And the more our wills, which are ours only to make them His, are fitted into God's method of operation in the Kingdom, the sooner and the more in its fulness will that Kingdom come.

Another need of conservation we would note is in the ramified machinery of the Church; and we speak of this as the last point on the material side of conservation, because it pertains to the local congregation, the Synod, and the general body. In the local congregation, organizations, clubs, public gatherings of various kinds, etc., not to speak of various devices to raise money for the congregation, are multiplying so fast that they require so much of the pastor's time, as well as that of a select band of lay workers, that he is just in that far prevented from developing the more important spiritual and other interests of the congregation, and from acquiring great pulpit power and recognized standing among the spiritual and intellectual leaders in his community and beyond its bounds. There is a legitimate place for these things, a normal number of such organizations, but the tendency is toward such a multiplication of them as not only to be devitalizing to the energies of the pastor, but even to be self-destructive to the more common and greater interests of the Church. Every church needs an organization for its married women, another for its married men, and probably two for its young people—one for those of maturer years and another for the younger element down to the age of confirmation. An organization, preferably of a missionary nature, for those below confirmation is also of great value in every congregation. These may indeed be differently named and distributed, but unnecessarily to multiply their number has a tendency to dissipate or destroy instead of to conserve. But, to be sure, the size of a congregation must to a certain extent govern their number. And as

to Synods, all agree that all synodical bodies that cover any considerable territory should be divided into Conferences which should have their own meetings in addition to that of the Synod as a whole. But here, too, conservation demands that these meetings be not too numerous. There are differences of opinion as to the number, but where the distances are great a happy compromise is, one meeting of Synod and one of Conference per year, the two at different times, say spring and fall respectively. Nor should these meetings be so long as to weary the delegates and compel busy laymen to leave before their close, nor too short to enable the body to do effective work. The amount of work to be done must, of course, determine; but this must not be so dragged out as simply to fulfill some sentimental *time* requirement. Time here, as elsewhere, is precious, and all time unnecessarily spent in such meetings is that much time lost for the local congregations. And to determine this amount we must multiply that time by the number of congregations represented or delegates in attendance. Here to conserve time is to conserve potential for work in saving souls. To this end we believe that, unless absolutely necessary, meetings continued over a Sunday, during which a number of churches would have to be without their pastors, by no means tend to conserve the Church and her higher interests. It is true that the local congregations where such meetings are held, receive some benefit; but this is much more than counterbalanced by the loss to a great number of churches, and therefore to a vastly greater number of people. But to set forth all the *pros* and *cons* of this question is not our purpose. The same arguments may be applied to the various Church organizations—Luther League, Missionary Societies, etc. Attending conventions is indeed very pleasant and profitable; but conventions may be so multiplied as to weary and react, and then their very purpose is defeated. At any rate, the possibility of developing what might be called *conventionitis* should be avoided.

## II. CONSERVATION ON THE SPIRITUAL SIDE

There is need of conservation not only on the material and temporal side of the Church, but also on the side of the spiritual and abiding or unchanging. Nay, in this age of doubt and shifting creeds, and amid a growing worldliness and the tendency even on the part of the Church itself to secularize things sacred, conservation is of supreme importance. The sanctity of things sacred must be conserved by the Church against secularization by contact with the world; and the unchanging and abiding truth must be conserved against destructive criticism and against the insidious so-called new theology that stalks abroad like a veritable angel of light to lead astray the unwary and unsuspecting. To develop this part of the subject as it *should* be developed, must necessarily lie beyond the limits of this article, as it would practically mean a polemic against the new theology and an apologetic of truth against error and religious counterfeits and of the Scriptures themselves against the destructive criticism. But a few words may be said upon this subject in both its ecclesiastical and its theological aspects.

## I. ITS ECCLESIASTICAL ASPECT

What should be the attitude of the Church toward the world? Should it, or should it not, so adapt itself to the world's ways as to secularize the sacred? Some worldly-wise sages have said, and not without *some* element of truth, that all things secular are, or should be, sacred, and that all things sacred must also be secular. Their idea is to have things sacred so sanctify things secular by their association or contact as to elevate them, so that the line of demarcation between the sacred and the secular would practically disappear, their difference being no longer one in kind but one in degree only. It is a beautiful ideal set before us, but it is philosophic rather than Christian or Scriptural. In its application it has already

so secularized a good part of the Church as hardly to distinguish it in some respects from a merely secular organization or humanitarian agency, while instead of sanctifying the secular it appears to have made it, if possible, even more worldly, because of its retreat or reaction from the Church in the latter's nearer approach to it. No, St. Paul says, "Be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God" (Rom. 12:2). And again he says, "Far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal. 6:14). So St. James gives as one of the elements of pure religion, "to keep oneself unspotted from the world" (James 1:27). And again he reminds the worldly-minded that "the friendship of the world is enmity with God", and that "whosoever therefore would be a friend of the world maketh himself an enemy of God" (4:4). In a similar strain St. John says, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John 2:15). Moreover, the Lord Himself repeatedly warned His disciples in a similar manner, as, for example, "If the world hateth you, ye know that it hath hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own: but because ye are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John 15:18-19). Among other similar emphatic statements are the following: "In the world ye have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John 16:33); "I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me; for they are thine" (John 17:9); "The world hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from evil. They are not of the world even as I am not of the world" (John 17:14-16). These passages afford sufficient proof that the Church should rather keep aloof from the world than



too freely mingle with it and its ways, and that she should lift the world up to herself, rather than stoop down to the world. The latter method, instead of making the world more reverent or churchly, surely makes the Church more irreverent and worldly. Here, then, conservation of the sacred and churchly is necessary if the Church would retain its true divinely-appointed position as the salt and saving agency of the world, and therefore as the supreme power for good. But, surely, "if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" (Matt. 5:13).

What shall we say of the adoption of the world's ways by the Church in the conduct of her sacred affairs? What sanction of Scripture or even of common sense then has the Church to strive to be as near like the world as possible only so as not to become entirely identical with it? How about the mere club spirit of part of the modern Church? And how about the sanctimonious subterfuges on the part of the modern Church to raise money by indirect commercial methods, not to speake of questionable chance and other methods, on the plea that it is for a good cause? Just as if the end justified the means! The Savior did not seem to think so, when, both near the beginning and near the end of His ministry, He drove the buyers and sellers and money changers from the Temple of God, although their plea was every whit as strong and legitimate as that of modern Church people, in the fact that part of the receipts went into the Temple treasury and that the very privilege of the ground on which they did their trading was a rental through the priests, partly for personal and partly for Temple gains. No, the Lord's method is to lay by on the first day of the week, according to the blessings received, to give *directly* to His cause, not by some roundabout method whereby the giver gets something himself, often a plate of ice cream or an oyster stew, while the Lord gets what is left—which often is little enough. Indeed, our gifts to the Lord should not be only the scraps that we may not want or need ourselves, a mere *collection*, but they

should amount to an *offering*—a sacrifice. And it is the Church's duty to conserve the method that has the Lord's own sanction, as against the method of the world, which is to give only to get and to make the getting the reason for the giving.

Then, also, whenever principle and truth are involved, instead of the children of light pretending to do as the world does so as not to offend the world, nay rather for the excuse of winning the world, they should not only be true to their better convictions but also consistent. Nor will the world credit them for so doing, but it will rather look upon such inconsistency with scorn. To desecrate God's consecrated house of worship by turning it into a club house (we had almost said a smoking house), a dining room or a concert hall, a moving picture show or a theater, on the plea that thus can the world be drawn into the Church, and even made to support it, is not only not conserving true churchliness and the sacredness of God's house, but it is inconsistent. And it fails not only in the end it sets before it, but it is also a sure sign that such church has lost true evangelic power and is spiritually bankrupt. To conduct a Sunday School picnic on the Lord's Day, or any other secularization and desecration of that Day, because it conveniences the Church people, is an offense to even the worldly-minded. And to convert the Sunday pulpit into a mere lecture platform or an attractive entertainment stage, simply because nowadays people want it so, is to yield the Church's very throne for the wielding of evangelic power to the subtle enemies of at least revealed truth. No, these things must be conserved if the Church's saving mission is to be fulfilled and the Kingdom's coming with power is to be hastened.

## II. ITS THEOLOGICAL ASPECT

We shall now pass from the Church's proper attitude toward secular things, as deduced from Scripture, to that of the Church's position as to doctrine. And on this

point we must more especially have regard to our own Church. Here, surely, conservation is of supreme importance if the Church is to prevail in her battle for truth against error. This is an age of *isms* and *schisms*. The disintegration of Reformed Protestantism is still going on, the chief cause of it being to give new and different expression to the accident, the form, the external; but the essence of the faith seems to be regarded by growing numbers as of but minor importance. This Babel of sects and *isms* has caused many people to ask in confusion, "Where is the true Church, seeing there are so many"? Multitudes of our own faith, reared in the mother Church of Protestantism in the *Old World*, knowing little of this sectarianism of the *New* with its proselyting spirit, are easily drawn aside into strange folds, or in despair turn a deaf ear to the voice of their own shepherds because of the Babel of the voices of others. Moreover, in minimizing the essentials of truth and magnifying the non-essentials of form and uniformity, these sects have given birth to gross errors in doctrine in their admixture of error with truth, so that only the initiated can tell where truth ends and error begins. Shall the Lutheran Church then yield in her attitude toward error simply to keep in the favor of errorists? Shall she, or shall she not, conserve the truth once delivered to the saints and sealed with the blood of martyrs, every formulation or formula of which marks a triumph in the upward progress of historic Christianity? While the good Lord no doubt saves multitudes in spite of their error, is that a reason for allowing truth to be disregarded and trampled under foot, as if it made no difference what one believes, as is indeed often asserted by certain sectarian propagandists?

Our answer to the above must be an emphatic negative. It is the duty of our Church, which once brought forth the truth anew from beneath the accumulated rubbish of centuries, to conserve that truth and to hand it down to succeeding generations in all its pristine purity. She must be true to the *faith* by proving faith-

ful to the *truth*. Many of the sects have drifted so far from the historic faith that they might well say, from their point of view, "It makes no difference what one believes only so that he lives right", as if the letter of the *commandments* exhausted the whole plan of salvation. That surely would be an attempt to *grow* into heaven by one's own efforts, as a prominent educator used to say, rather than to enter there through the merits of Christ according to the *divine* plan of salvation. The Unitarian in looking upon our Savior's perfect humanity and disregarding or explaining away His equally true divinity, has not only lost the chief element of hope and comfort that should be His through that divine nature alone, but he has taken all meaning not only out of Christ's atoning death but also out of all the Old Testament prophecies, types, and sacrifices. The key to the mysteries of life and history here, and to life hereafter, would thus be thrown away, while the very purpose of Revelation would be defeated and its ultimate meaning would be lost. The Universalist in looking upon divine mercy alone, minimizes punishment hereafter, or even denies its reality, and thus belittles the greatness of sin and in effect sets aside the great central doctrine of the atonement. The Savior's merits are thus of little need or value, and the ultimate upshot of such teaching is virtual Unitarianism. So of the merely ethical tendencies of a growing element in the Church of Christ. No wonder that a wave of practical Unitarianism is sweeping over the Christian world. The so-called Christian Scientist in denying the reality of sin, sickness and death, as the result of a vague and self-contradictory idealism, which with its subtle errors is but little understood by even its most intelligent exponents, thus removes all need of atonement and hence of an atoning Savior. This fact is the key to the generally misunderstood optimism of its adherents, who in all consistency can have no *reason* to fret over only apparent or unreal human ills, whether they affect others or themselves. And in their misinterpretation or misconception of the Scriptural teaching of

the infinitude of God, its exponents really include themselves in an idealistic pantheism that minimizes all individuality here and totally blots it out in a fuller pantheistic reabsorption in the great hereafter. They have thus denied the fundamental elements of Christian theism, with the Jesus Christ of history and His most essential teachings altogether left out, and have set up a subtle pantheism that cannot stand the test of either science or philosophy. In reality, the title that would match this consummate counterfeit, which might be a masterpiece of the archenemy of mankind himself, should be Unchristian Nescience, as it is neither Christian nor scientific.

It is becoming more and more apparent that it is largely to the Lutheran Church to which American Christianity must look, and is indeed already beginning to look, as the great bulwark of truth against open and more subtle and insidious onslaughts of error. She is the Church of the *Conservative* Reformation in contradistinction from the Reformed Churches of the more radical Reformation. Her revolt was against the dead formalism and traditionalism of Rome with its inevitable tendency toward stagnation, and it was she that conserved the truth against a lifeless crystallization. But it is no less her duty to conserve that same truth against the disintegrating and destructive tendency of other parts of what choose to call themselves Protestants. Reformation, not revolution, is the proper characterization of the great historic movement led by her, while rather revolution than Reformation is the proper characterization of the great movement which gave birth to Reformed Protestantism. The Lutheran Church set the truth in motion anew after its long slumber of centuries, while a good part of Reformed Protestantism has endeavored to break with the old unchanging truth and to start new truth on its careering through the centuries. It is therefore ours to conserve the old that is tried and true, not only against Romish error but also against the new whose chief merit is that it is new. It is indeed in-

cumbent upon our Church to prove all things; but she must not fail to hold fast that which is good. Ours is the Church of the *Reformation*, the Reformation that reformed, but did not break with the old Church Catholic; and she also conserved the truth against the radical tendency of fanaticism and iconoclasm. Let the American Lutheran Church then prove true to her history by proving faithful in her unmistakable mission also during this twentieth century, as the chief conservator of the unchanging truth of the unchangeable God.

*St. Paul, Minnesota.*

## ARTICLE V.

## THE WAYS OF THE CRITICS.

A SHARP CONTRAST BETWEEN THE LIBERALS AND THE  
CONSERVATIVES.

By PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

A study of a number of recent books on the so-called "liberal" side of the problem of Biblical criticism brings out some strikingly characteristic "ways of the critics". The thing that constantly amazes us is the *aplomb* of the liberalistic writers, their utter presumption of being in possession of the whole truth, with apparently no knowledge of the masterly works published on the evangelical side. To read only the liberalists, you would never know that such evangelical scholars as Henstenberg, Keil, Moeller, Orr, Cave, Robertson, Bissell, Green, Bartlett, Redpath, Wiener, Warfield, Wilson, and scores of others had ever existed on this mundane sphere.

One of these recent books (1918) is Dr. W. E. Hopkins' "The History of Religion". The author seems to deal fairly and historically with the ethnic religions, but when he comes to the Hebrew religion, he loses his sagacity, and warps and twists the history in accordance with the theory of evolution, of which he is a proponent. No matter what the Bible says, he knows better than that revered old Book. He merely echoes the views of the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen-Cheyne-Driver school, without so much as stopping to consider whether its teachings are correct or not. Statement upon statement is made with a cock-sureness that would be amusing, if it were not so vital in its influence on the destiny of immortal souls. Dr. Hopkins' treatment of Christianity is so inadequate and one-sided, so lacking in the spiritual and uplifting element, that, if it were a correct repre-



sentation, our holy religion would not be worth holding and contending for. If Christianity is what he makes it out to be, we for one would be willing to renounce it as absurd. Apparently, however, the author is not acquainted with any historians save those of the latitudinarian order. Yet his work is intended for a text-book in our American colleges and universities.

Another book of the same sort is Professor Albert C. Knudson's "The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament". In this work the critical assumptions are all taken for granted. Says a competent critic of the book: "The long controversy about the Pentateuch has now reached a stage at which it is no longer possible for any writer who claims to be up to date simply to put before his public the exploded conclusions of the Astruc-Kuenen-Wellhausen school as the last word of scholarship". Yet that is precisely what Knudson has done. His work was published in 1918. Was he not aware of the publication of the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, with its array of profound scholars on the conservative side? If he was, he gives no signs. If he was not, what is to be said of his "scholarship"?

Here comes another book copyrighted in 1919: "How the Bible Grew", by Frank Grant Lewis, issued by the University of Chicago Press. The very phrasing of the title gives a clue to the character of the book. The Bible "grew", was evolved; it was not God-breathed, divinely given and inspired! We quote with endorsement from a review of this book in "Bibliotheca Sacra"; "This volume is devoted from beginning to end to popularizing the documentary theories of the Wellhausen school as applied to the old Testament, and of the moderately radical critics of the New Testament. It gives no indication of the writer's familiarity with the more recent discussions relating to the authorship of the Pentateuch, or of the most recent conclusions concerning the date of the writings of the New Testament books. There is scarcely a single reference to a conservative

author. The lay reader will, therefore, find it a blind guide to the real truth".

Another book, though printed in 1914, has just come into our hands. It is Dr. J. Paterson Smyth's "The Bible in the Making, in the Light of Modern Research". There are many good things in this work. The author tries to uphold the doctrine of divine inspiration, and seems to think that he has succeeded. But a careful reading uncovers the fact that he trains in the Driver school of critics. With him the Bible is largely made up of tradition, folklore, legend and Hebraic "ideas". How can he correlate this view with any doctrine of divine inspiration that is worth holding? Many fine recent writers have proved this position to be untenable. But note, there is no evidence in the book that the author is even aware of any of many stalwart works in favor of the conservative position that have been issued in recent years. With the utmost cock-sureness the critical views are accepted and propagated as settled once for all. One is almost tempted to say that the "advanced" critics are becoming ultra-conservatives and extreme traditionalists.

One of the strangest paradoxes about the more moderate critics is their conception of divine inspiration. They insist that they have the true idea of divine inspiration and the correct evaluation of the Holy Scriptures, and that to them it is a much more precious book because of their critical conclusions; and yet, at the same time, they speak of the Bible as being made up of legends, myths and folklore, the conceptions of very primitive people, crude and mistaken in many ways, with actual contradictions here and there in the records. Is that an adequate and satisfactory conception of divine inspiration? Is it an inspiration that is worth while and that makes the Bible a reliable book in its religious teaching? Is it not too near the pantheistic idea of divine inspiration—that is, that everything that happens is inspired because everything is the evolution of God in the universe? According to this conception, even error

and sin are to be attributed to the ultimate source of being. Moral distinctions fade out to the vanishing point. "Everything that is is right", according to the pantheistic world-view. Are not the modern exponents of evolution too much given to this conception? Hence they can get divine inspiration out of the errors and sins of primitive people. We are willing to believe, as the Bible teaches, that God can "bring good out of evil and make the wrath of man to praise Him"; but that is something totally different from a special divine inspiration on which men can rely for salvation both in time and in eternity.

A fatal difficulty with the radical criticism is that its logical outcome is rationalism pure and simple. If the Bible is partly inspired and partly uninspired, how are we to know which are the inspired portions and which are not? Each man must decide for himself. That makes human reason the final arbiter. What appeals to reason is called inspired; what is not according to reason is not inspired. If that is not rationalism, what is rationalism? Now, when we consider the achievements of unaided human reason historically, have we much encouragement to put confidence in its processes? The pagan nations of the earth have had reason to guide them all through their history in the absence of special revelation. What has been the result? Paganism in all its forms, from animism to pantheistic Hinduism and pessimistic and atheistic Buddhism. The ancient philosophers had reason to guide them, but even the best of them—Plato and Aristotle—thought that matter was eternal and that God was not the real creator; while Democritus, Epicurus and Lucretius held to the materialistic world-view. How much agreement is there today among the apostles of pure reason? We have, among many other world-views materialistic monism (Haeckel and Leuba), idealism, positivism, pantheism, vitalism, "creative evolution" (whatever that means), and pluralism, not to mention a dozen more conflicting philosophies. Do all these fundamental divergences beget much

confidence in mere human reason as a trustworthy guide? Yet the dissecting critics would make reason rather than the Bible the final court of appeal. Even among them there is much difference of opinion as to which parts of the Bible are inspired and which are not inspired. On the ground of mere human judgment you never can arrive at a consensus among even a half dozen speculatists. No; the view of the critics respecting divine inspiration is illogical and inadequate. Let them spend half their time and effort in trying to reconcile *apparent* discrepancies in the Bible, instead of exploiting them, and they will readily find that its teaching from beginning to end is a wonderful unity.

Having pointed out "the ways of the critics" of the reducing school, namely, that they simply ignore the works of conservative scholars, or keep themselves blindly uninformed regarding them, it is a pleasure to turn to a Biblical investigator of a different ilk. We refer to the Rev. J. S. Griffiths and his book, "The Problem of Deuteronomy", which we have read with much satisfaction. It was published in 1911, and won the Bishop Jeune Memorial Prize for the best essay on "The Historical Truth and Divine Authority of the Book of Deuteronomy". The fact that it won the prize in a contest with other competitors is worthy of note, and gives the reader confidence to begin with. We have a special purpose in calling attention to the date of its publication—1911. That was before the radical books previously mentioned were issued—Smyth's in 1914, Hopkins' in 1918, Knudson's in 1918, and Lewis' in 1919. Do these works make any reference to Griffiths' masterly treatment of Deuteronomy? They do not. They seem to be blissfully unconscious that so complete a refutation of their central position was ever given to the world. Now we maintain that such treatment of opponents is unfair and unethical. No man who writes merely on one side of the Biblical question has a right to speak of "the assured results of scholarship", when such a work as that of Mr. Griffiths is accessible.

And what is the "way" of this scholar? The precise opposite of the self-pluming critics. He takes nothing for granted. His aim is to prove every position by the soundest rational process that he is capable of commanding. He makes no assertions that he does not try to establish by sound argument and by appeal to facts. Moreover, he does not ignore his opponents, but mentions many of them by name, quotes from their works, giving the titles and pages, and then demolishes their conclusions. To our mind, he does his work handsomely and thoroughly, not by dogmatic asseveration, but by sound argument. We believe we can do no better service than to indicate "the way" of this scholar by making a number of quotations from his work, showing how acutely he reasons.

Our author holds that Deuteronomy is "the pivot of the Pentateuchal criticism" (page 9), and quotes Graf, Dillman, Wellhausen, Kittel, Westphal and Addis in support of the assertion. Note that, on the very page of his discussion proper, he mentions a list of opposing liberal critics. How different his method from that of most of the liberals! On pages 11-13 he argues for the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. This he does against the critics, who say that little or none of it is of Mosaic origin, and fix the date of its composition at about 620 B. C. Dr. Driver speaks of "an ancient traditional basis" and "an independent source, oral or written". "As if oral tradition and tradition reduced to writing," exclaims our author, "were not two things as far apart as heaven and earth!" Dr. Driver suggests that the author of Deuteronomy may have "derived his authority from more than one source; his secondary authority being sometimes popular tradition, sometimes, perhaps, his own imagination". On this point our author reasons as follows: "These scholars seem to forget that the 'value of tradition depends absolutely on the date at which it ceased to be oral by becoming fixed in writing. If recorded at first hand, or nearly so, it may have all the authority of contemporaneous history. But as genera-

tions come and go, and the events recede into the dim past, that which is handed down simply by word of mouth soon degenerates, and, parting with the reality of life, rapidly vanishes into the misty air of myth and fable. After the lapse of a few generations, oral tradition loses all pretence of simple truth' (quoted from Sir W. Muir's "Authorship of Deuteronomy"). "Meinhold (himself an 'advanced' critic) admits that if, on the grounds of literary criticism, Deuteronomy is to be dated at 620 B. C., no credibility can be attached to its historical statements. Besides, if the critical theory is right, the statements made in Deut. 1:1,5, 29:1, 31:9, 24-27, must be false. And if the book is not to be believed when it distinctly affirms its Mosaic origin, on what grounds are we to accept its assertions on other points?" The first passages cited above are (verse 1): "These are the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond the Jordan in the wilderness", etc.; (verse 5): "Beyond the Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare this law, saying", etc. If this is not reliable history, why should other parts of the book be regarded as reliable? That is Mr. Griffiths' argument. Then he continues:

"Again, if Deuteronomy is, as the 'advanced' critics claim, 'a protest of the prophetic party of the seventh century B. C. against the connection of unspiritual and heathen elements with the worship of Yahweh', issued in the name of Moses by 'men who thought the time ripe for reform and had intelligently planned the way in which this was to be effected', it is not easy to accept it as a divinely authorized code of laws. \* \* But Deuteronomy speaks with an accent of *authority*: it lays down certain laws which were to be strictly observed by the Jewish people; and the authority which it claims is the authority of Moses as the 'man of God', divinely commissioned to legislate for Israel. It was on this ground—that it was the genuine word of Moses—that its authority was recognized, and its enactments obeyed by Josiah and his subjects. But if the book itself and most of the laws it contains were unknown to Moses, its

claim falls to the ground. It is as certain as anything can be that, if King Josiah and his people had held the 'critical' view of the origin of Deuteronomy, they would never have accepted the book as divine".

And yet the moderate critics make the claim that Deuteronomy was divinely inspired! What kind of divine inspiration would that be? It would be as poor for inspiration as the reasoning of the rationalists is for logic.

We must pass over a large part of Mr. Griffiths' book (though every page is worthy of careful perusal), and come to his analysis of the critical hypothesis that Deuteronomy was imposed upon the people of Israel as a reform document many centuries after Moses. We drop down on page 97 at Chapter V, "The Critical Theory: Its Difficulties". Says our author: "If Deuteronomy is not Mosaic, when and by whom was it composed? Modern critics cannot agree on an answer; and their lack of agreement on a point so vital undoubtedly tells heavily against the cause they represent. Two solutions are suggested". In a footnote a number of other theories are named, showing how much divergence of opinion there is among the "scholarly" critics. By the way, if the "results" of "scholarship" are "assured", one would think that the "scholars" ought to agree. But they don't! Ewald, Bleek, W. R. Smith, Ryle, Driver, and others assign Deuteronomy to the reign of Manasseh; while Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Cornill, Cheyne, and others assign it to the time of Josiah. In either case serious difficulties arise. The author deals more fully with the view that the book was imposed as a Mosaic document on the people of Israel in King Josiah's reign. He contends thus: "To say that Deuteronomy was written in the time of Josiah, and that Hilkiah and the priests were parties to its production", is "to cast a serious imputation on the moral character of these men. For the narrative expressly states that Hilkiah recognized the book as an ancient and authoritative law-book. He said, 'I have found the book of the law'; (2 Kings 22:8), and in the Hebrew



the definite article is emphatic. If Hilkiah was not deceived, he was himself guilty of gross deception; for, led by him, king and people accepted the book as an ancient code which had been disobeyed by their *fathers* (2 Kings 22:13). Here quite a number of awkward questions immediately rise up to confound the critics. Why should the law of central sanctuary be invented at a time when almost all the rival sanctuaries had gone down in the ruin of the Northern kingdom? Why should the priests be so eager to foist upon the nation a code which certainly did not promote their interests, and in one particular—the law of Deut. 18:6f.—was distinctly detrimental to them? And how did it come to pass that people, priests and prophets recognized as Mosaic, legislation which (according to criticism) was so opposed on many important points to all that up to that time had been regarded as such?

“But, indeed”, our author continues, “that such a colossal fraud could have been carried out successfully is simply incredible. The *extent* of the alleged deception is truly marvellous. The whole nation with lamb-like innocence allowed themselves to be imposed upon. The priests of Jerusalem, to whom, as Kautzsch says, the book must have been intensely disagreeable; the priests of the high place, whom it threw out of employment; the king, whose ancestors it pilloried; and the people on whose cherished religious customs it poured the fiercest denunciations—all were completely deceived. Even Jeremiah, who exposed unhesitatingly the false prophecies of his own contemporaries (Jer. 29f.), publicly defended Deuteronomy as the legislation of Moses (Jer. 11). This amazing fraud was successful—so we are to believe—in spite of the hostility which must have been provoked by a work which assailed so many interests, and in spite, too, of the searching inquiries to which such hostility would give rise. According to criticism, the book contains many important modifications and contradictions of the laws previously accepted as Mosaic—discrepancies clearly evident to eminent scholars of the

nineteenth and twentieth centuries; yet these astonishing Jews of the seventh century B. C., though they disliked it, and after a brief period of alarm disregarded it, never questioned its genuineness. Many persons must have been concerned in its production, but no hint of the secret ever leaked out. Even in the time of apostasy which followed Josiah's reformation, neither kings, priests nor people ever tried to justify their relapse by impugning the Mosaic authority of the book. Marvelous indeed was this deception, so carefully carried out, so perfect in every detail. But far more wonderful are those lynx-eyed critics who, after the lapse of twenty-four centuries, are able to expose this ingenious fraud which the Jews of Josiah's age—though they had every opportunity and incentive to do so—could not penetrate!"

Then the author goes on to show that, if the critics are right, "Deuteronomy is a deliberate falsehood. It is not an adequate reply to say airily that, when the author assumed the Mosaic mask, he only 'made use of an acknowledged device', and that men in those days 'perpetrated such fictions without a qualm of conscience' (Kuenen)". Here we would like to inject the question, On this hypothesis what becomes of the doctrine of divine inspiration? Even if men in those palmy days would have perpetrated "such fictions without a qualm of conscience", would the Holy Spirit have used the same dishonest and dishonorable methods? We have always thought that, according to the Holy Scriptures, the Holy Spirit was "the Spirit of truth". The critical conception of divine inspiration would be surely comical, if the results to the evangelical faith were not so serious and calamitous.

But our alert author challenges Kuenen's assertion about such fictions being common in the days of Josiah (pages 101, 102). "It is necessary", he declares, "that at least one undoubted instance should be quoted in evidence. But this the critics invariably omit to do. If fictions of this kind were common in the seventh century B. C., surely it would be possible to mention one instance.

If none can be cited, how do the critics know that the practice was common? \* \* \* \* But there is not a shred of evidence that such 'literary practices' were common or considered justifiable in the age of Josiah or at any earlier time. Galen, a very competent witness, assures us that it was not till the age of the Ptolemies, when kings were rivaling each other in collecting libraries, that the 'roguery' (so this unenlightened heathen regarded it) of forging writings and titles began. It is evident from this that the practice was not looked upon as lawful even among the heathen. How then can we reconcile such 'roguery' with the lofty religious and moral principles enunciated so fervently in the book of Deuteronomy? The so-called discrepancies between Deuteronomy and the other codes, which the critics parade with such pomp, fade into nothingness when compared with the astounding contradiction between the spiritual tone of the book and the fraud which gave it birth. 'Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?'

In the next few pages our author vividly portrays the remarkable intelligence of the author of Deuteronomy if he wrote the book in the times of Josiah. What a complete disguise the work was! He lived in the seventh century, and yet transported himself so perfectly into the times and circumstances of Moses eight centuries prior as to give the whole record the air of historical verisimilitude, never committing an anachronism. "When we reflect how difficult it is even today to reproduce with exactness the scenery and circumstances of the past, we must recognize in this nameless forger an antiquarian of the first rank. Further, he not only adopts with conspicuous success the Mosaic garb; he embodies the Mosaic spirit. He speaks in the tone and from the standpoint of the great leader. He has caught and reproduced the emotions and desires, the confident optimism and happy hopefulness of Moses on the eve of the immigration. It is one of the greatest triumphs of the human imagination. So completely has he transported himself into the Mosaic age that he is absolutely unconscious of his own

environment. The intervening centuries, with all their doleful history of backsliding and persecution, of disaster and defeat, are utterly ignored." There is more argument here to the same effect. "He proclaims a war of extermination against the Canaanites, as though they had not been destroyed long before! \* \* In a word, he never even for a moment drops the Mosaic mask". He certainly was a master of "camouflage". That such a genius could have existed in the seventh century B. C., and yet leave no trace of his identity, is beyond rational belief.

And think of it! This man of such commanding intellectual gifts and such "remarkable insight and lofty ethical ideals", in order to bring about a reform, "perpetrates a fraud" upon his contemporaries—a fraud, too, "which he himself denounces in the severest terms!" Then the author cites Deut. 18:20: "But the prophet who shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or who shall speak in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die". If Hilkiah or any else in Josiah's day wrote that verse, and falsely attributed it to Moses, he was a hypocrite of the deepest dye. Is it any wonder that evangelical scholars contend that the critical position is destructive of the whole doctrine of divine inspiration and authority?

After thus dissecting the hypothesis of the dissecting Biblical critics, Mr. Griffiths concludes this part of his argument with these words, with which we are constrained to agree: "We may fairly claim that, whether we consider the literary influence of Deuteronomy, its relations to the other Pentateuchal books, the character of its contents, or the problem of its origin and authorship, on every point the critical theory breaks down completely. Our examination of its claims in the light of the available evidence has only served to demonstrate their falsity, and to show that no date and no authorship fit the book of Deuteronomy save those which it distinctly claims for itself".

There is much more fine argument in this book, but we need not continue our quotations. Three things are evident from the preceding presentation. The first is that the rationalists are the poorest reasoners in the world and the most consummate dogmatists and asseverators. The second is that their theories, if proven true, would undermine any view of divine inspiration that would be worthy of confidence. The third is that there is a marked contrast between the "ways" of the radical critics and those of the conservative scholars; the former mostly ignore the works of their opponents, and simply repeat over and over again their baseless assumptions without argument and with constant arrogation to themselves of having attained "assured results"; while the latter—the conservatives—not only mention their opponents, cite their works, quote from them, giving title and page, but also enter into an elaborate argumentative process to prove their antagonists wrong and their own positions correct. Of the sharply contrasted "ways of the critics", we greatly prefer those of the conservatives as being by far the more rational and ethical.

*Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE VI.

SOME ERRATIC CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF  
AMERICAN LUTHERANISM

By

PROF. DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D., LL.D.

The history of the Christian Church records some failures and even some heart-rending tragedies. Parts of the one true Church of the living God have at times displayed some narrowness and spiritual poverty, while some others have abandoned for a season the historical spirit and well nigh forgotten a heritage of approved and tested riches in the spheres of faith and practice. And in all candor it must be said that it would be surprising were this not true. The kingdom of God is being set up among men who are as yet fallible in their judgments and estimates and not among the angels in heaven. The Church is not yet an academy of completed saints, all of whom have attained unto perfection in knowledge and good works.

To advance now, from these preliminary reflections, we may, with some assurance, affirm that there is a useful and comforting lesson to be discovered in the very imperfections and failures of the Church. They tend to give us a more hopeful view of its prospects in the earth. The fluctuations seem to be very human sometimes but the tide, we may always be assured, is produced by celestial influences. One advancing plan pervades all. The alarms, the dangers, the persecutions, the capricious movements, and the cutting loose sometimes from the past, which seriously imperils the future, and other depressing features in the earthly development of the Church as well as the corruptions from which it has

safely emerged, are all so many incidental, guarantees that the Church itself is indestructible. Speaking of the Church in one of his fine essays, Dean Church says, "The history of the Christian Church has hardly fulfilled its promise, has not realized on a large scale the ideal of the New Testament. It has been a very mixed history; on the one hand great efforts, definite improvements, and progress; on the other perplexing disappointment, inconsistency, and degeneracy."

It is even so as this fine historian of the Oxford movement says, and the story we might expect to find, always glorious and luminous, with consistency in an uninterrupted advancement, illustrates repeatedly and pathetically that passage in which the Lord's Apostle explodes the dream of a fond optimism, and points to a law of failure or "vanity," to which creation has been made subject and not creation only, "but ourselves, also who have the first fruits of the Spirit; even we too are under this bondage, we too must wait for a full adoption to set us free." It is true indeed that the failures and inconsistencies of the church in its aggregate, which, in its earthly career let it always be remembered, is made up of fallible and not always consistent men and women, are a trial sometimes to one's faith often saddening and well nigh overwhelming. They test the faith of the believer and sometimes supply the unbeliever with taunting and provoking gibes and hostile reflections. At some periods in its history we confront a long record of reverses, blunders and drawbacks. Sometimes the cause of the Lord is compromised by the weaknesses, the sins of omission and commission and unexpected displays of inconsistency on the part of the Lord's own people, of whom too much, it must be said in all candor, is expected by the unregenerate and unsympathetic world. Great teachers have at times been found to be using one sided language and have failed to make an inadequate induction into all the facts, and even saints are sometimes in-



defensible and slow to believe that the other saints can really and truly be good. Plans for good are marred, zeal is debarred by unexpected and unhistorical developments while institutions that had been founded in faith and hope early exhibit the seeds of disappointment if not corruption.

John Keble, the devout author of, "The Christian Year," once said that, "The time of the church on earth is a time of crosses not only of persecutions and direct hostility, but of hopes and expectations cut off." It may be that we are sometimes disposed to wonder why the Head of the Church, has ever allowed any kind of inconsistency to invade the life of His Church and why that life, which is from God, has not flowed on uninterrupted by any kind of inconsistencies or counter movements. We may at times be disposed to fret ourselves over some of the aspects of the divine government as we contemplate them in the ongoing of the Church. But the counter inducements are always strong that we should possess our souls in peace as we remember that the Lord Himself, who foresaw the denials of Peter, and the apostasy and treachery of Judas Iscariot, the timidity of John Mark who went back, and of Paul forsaken by Demas and others in the critical incidents of his great life, also predicted that false Christs should arise and that the incoming tides of iniquity should chill love in many hearts. All that is painful in the long career of the church has for centuries of its history been going on before the throne of Him of whom one perplexed soul once said, "When He is not, and not until then, shall I lose courage".

It is not the purpose of the writer, in the preparation of this paper to undertake to present for contemplation and at any length, a portrayal of these more regretful chapters from the history of the church, but rather to present a brief study of some of the erratic, unhistorical and inconsistent movements in the life of a single communion and that even restricted to a single country.

Today all students of history are trained in the appli-

cation of the scientific method. History does not move in the domain of fiction, but in that of carefully ascertained facts. It has to do with what has actually transpired, with the endurances and achievements and opinions of a real and not a Utopian commonwealth. What the ordinary reader wishes to know about the history of a religious body, as of a nation, is what are the well ascertained facts established by evidence of indubitable genuineness and testified to be competent, cotemporary observers and participants. The tracing of side movements which have been diverted from the main line of the life and development of any particular church, the noting of erratic chapters in its history or abnormal ecclesiastical side issues are legitimate and necessary parts of the history of any particular body of Christians.

The story of Lutheranism in this country, for example, as a specific apprehension and development of generic Christianity, has often been told by competent and sympathetic historians, but for the most part, with primary reference to its accepted beliefs, its organization and its missionary, educational and philanthropic undertakings. The religious life itself, which is a part of that history, its dominating motives, its fundamental principles and their characteristic expression, the manifestation of spiritual power among the men and women who have been included under the name Lutheran, the genius of Lutheran piety, the various vicissitudes and inner movements in harmony with its genius and of others alien to its history and life, these have not been so frequently noted and traced to their underlying causes.

Knowledge of Lutherans in this country, even sometimes among supposedly well informed people, is often confined to one single presupposition, that Lutherans constitute a religious body bearing the name of Martin Luther, a man, as they esteem him, who is alleged in his time to have been a somewhat commanding personality, and one who filled a somewhat conspicuous place in certain conflicts waged in Central Europe in the sixteenth

century. This, to be sure, is accurate knowledge so far as it goes, but it goes but a brief way to explain, define and interpret. The historians of the Lutheran peoples in this land, peoples who have been here since the first quarter of the seventeenth century, have given the facts about the origin and growth of their denomination and adequately set forth these facts as they pertain to various men, different synods and widely scattered congregations.

The writer of this article has thought that it may be of some interest and, as he trusts, profit, to direct some specific attention to a few of those somewhat sporadic movements and aspects of the life and history of the same peoples in this land, which he has been pleased to classify under the word, "erratic" There were movements associated with the work and development of the Lutheran Church at some periods of its history in America, which were not outgrowths of its real genius, teachings, methods and history. Some of the chapters in our denominational history, the writer is fully persuaded, have no parallel in the life of any other religious body in this land.

1. First among these we may mention the introduction, at one period of the history of Lutheranism in this land, of that specious and powerless rationalism that had, before it was brought here, worked deplorable results in lands beyond the sea. In its beginning, Lutheranism was an effort to recover and apply the doctrines of the Gospel in their fullness and integrity. Its essence is not to be found, first of all, in opposition to errors and abuses that had fastened themselves upon the Mediaeval Church, but in the reassertion of positive evangelical truth. It was constructive and positive rather than destructive and negative. It was more of a reaffirmation than a species of denial, which is of the nature of rationalism. As a particular apprehension of the Gospel, Lutheranism was organized around a system of beliefs so pronouncedly and consistently evangelical that it was at every point antithetical to Rationalism. Its complete

triumph over this species of unbelief, when it came into conflict with it as well as its particular freedom from it at this day, show that the one cannot live alongside the other. Lutheranism stands for that which is positive and unambiguous in the sphere of religious truth while rationalism rejects every positive element of the Christian faith and has never yet reached a consistent series of truths which can be proved by reason. In the eighteenth century certain foreign influences of a pronounced rationalistic order had been introduced into German Christianity. In that land the process of incorporation was rapid. A remarkable activity of mind at once became observable in the theological world, and men of great learning and strong intellectual endowments at once began to apply the deductions of the English and French deistic rationalism to the criticism of the sacred Scriptures.

By and by the same destructive views found their way from Germany into this country. In the application of its evangelical principles, on these shores, Lutheranism was, especially in view of its historical antecedents, destined to encounter the new, "Illuminism" or "Rationalism". To have escaped from its baleful influences, when all of the historical facts are estimated, aright, was something not to be expected. It is well to recall the fact that the fore-runners of Pietism, such as John Arndt and Valentine Andrea, as well as the leaders of the movement, itself, such as Spener and Francke, in its earlier history, were confessional Lutherans of the stiffest order. These men were wise enough to keep doctrine and life, faith and good works in proper coordination. They made of Halle, the center of the Pietistic movement, the seat of the great missionary and philanthropic activities that have continued to this day. But there followed in the wake of the work of these men, a degenerate sentimental and inactive pietism. Its disciples became introspective, distrustful of science and literature until, by and by, those healthy modes of thought and feeling, which are also part of God's truth

and God's world, were neglected and ignored. There came to be associated with this kind of pietism an affected language about spiritual experiences, real in the first outburst of religious emotion, no doubt, but cultivated and mechanical when it was no longer genuinely real. It not only became injurious to the individual but, as is usual with such manifestations of religion, it at last came to sound ostentatious and hollow to the hearers. This phase of the movement tried to detain the heart in a state of self-inspection and its disciples cultivated language about it that became unreal.

Of the earlier Pietism, a Scotch Presbyterian historian has affirmed that, "One may find there the germs of most of our modern movements; of Home Missions, Ragged Schools, Bible circulation, Tract Societies and Foreign Missions." But the later Pietism busied itself chiefly with experiences, its advocates and exponents confining their attention to their own members, as "brethren" and "sisters", who possessed a higher amount of religious life than ordinary Christians. They fostered select companies in German Christianity, that were known as "*ecclesiolae in ecclesia*". Men lacked the power of united government, discipline and action, keeping aloof in self-satisfied isolation, not only from the ungodly world but from what was alleged to be the formalism which prevailed in the churches around them. These peoples gradually became isolated companies of sincere people with a large amount of spiritual pride, and a growing narrowness which gave a bad name to Pietism.

But the time of reaction against this divorce of Christianity from humanity was certain to come. And when it came it was in behalf of the bare, cold understanding, which assumed the name of reason. The one sided and over-strained mysticism led to its opposite, a one sided rationalism, which left no room for feeling in religion and which rejected everything it could not understand and reduce to the processes of the human reason.

About 1750, Semler, "the father of modern destructive criticism", became professor at Halle. It is enough

to say that at the end of the eighteenth century no discernable trace of either Pietism or orthodoxy survived at Halle. The influences of the changed religious situation soon began to manifest themselves, not only in Germany but in the Lutheran Church in this country. Some of the younger cotemporaries of Muhlenberg had been educated at Halle and felt the influence of the weakening, altho not yet of the surrender, of the rationalizing teachers to the fast approaching era of the destructive criticism. Some of them had been students under Semler at Halle, in his earlier career there, and had imbibed some of the destructive views of their teacher. Dr. Helmuth, eloquent preacher and faithful pastor, who had served at Lancaster and Philadelphia, Pa., in a letter to the "Patriarch", Muhlenberg, in 1785, had expressed his sorrow and his apprehensions about the spread of rationalism. In a letter of reply Muhlenberg, evidently moved with deep concern, declared that such news should serve to lead men to earnest prayer, while assuring his fellow laborer that the errors that caused concern to both must, according to the divine assurances, at last end in failure, and that in the end the truth alone would be found enduring. The same radical tendencies soon became manifest in changes in the constitutions of the older Lutheran Synods, the most serious changes being found in the elimination from such constitutions of all confessional tests. The thinking and expression of parts of the church seem to have been smitten with ambiguity. Catechists were required to preach the Word of God in its purity, "according to the law and the Gospel", a statement that may mean much or little, according to the standpoint of the teacher. References to the Augsburg Confession, not to say anything about later symbols of the church, so prominent in earlier constitutions, in the days of a more consistent Lutheranism disappeared.

Before the year 1800, and probably with the making of a new constitution, the obligation taken by catechists, in the oldest Lutheran body in the country, consisted

only in this bit of hazy religious generalization. "I, the undersigned, promise before God and my chief Shepherd, Jesus Christ, that I will preach God's Word in its purity, according to law and Gospel, as it is presented, according to its chief parts, in our Catechism and Hymnbook. I promise also diligently to hold instruction for children, to visit the sick, to feed souls, and to administer Holy Baptism according to the order of Jesus Christ".

To the same class of erratic and unhistorical tendencies in this period of our denominational history, belongs the outburst of Socinianism in the Ministerium of New York. This synod had been organized in 1786. The liberal leader in this outbreak of Un-Lutheran Rationalism was the able and influential leader, Dr. Frederick Henry Quitman, pastor at Rhinebeck, New York. He was a man of commanding force and of imposing stature. He has been described as a stately person, over six feet in height and of correspondingly broad and powerful build. Already at his entrance in Halle, one of the professors greeted the nineteen year old giant with the words, "*Quanta Ossa; Quantum robur! What bones! What power!*". Quitman had the qualities of a commanding leader, being possessed of a strong intellect and a forceful will. He had been a disciple of Semler at Halle and became in this country a strong protagonist of the rationalistic views of his master. For twenty years this man was the dominating figure in one of the oldest Lutheran bodies in this country, and under his leadership that body participated in the organization of the General Synod in 1820.

In the catechism prepared by Quitman and published in 1814, with the consent and approbation of the synod, of which he was the leader, do we find a pronounced indication of the dangerous departure from the Lutheran apprehension of the Gospel. In this manual of popular instruction we encounter an entirely new exposition of the faith of the church and discover a substitute for the robust evangelicalism of Luther's famous and widely



used Catechism. Its teaching was not only erroneous but its form of literary expression so pedantic and clumsy as to render it well nigh harmless as a book for the instruction of the young. It starts out with the assumption, to use the language of the catechism itself, that "the grounds of rational belief are natural perception, the authority of competent witnesses and unquestionable arguments of reason". It taught that the divine image in man had "only been stained by sin". In it we find omitted and denied such fundamental doctrines as those of the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, the vicarious Atonement, Justification by faith in Christ and others. In this book its able author, with the approval of the New York Ministerium, it is to be presumed, declares, "The Gospel teaches us that Christ suffered and died in order to seal with His blood the doctrine which He had preached", thus making of Jesus a martyr for His convictions, and nothing more. In this catechism, the children were to be taught such merely pagan ethics as this to "respect humanity" and to "never disgrace our dignity". The "forgiveness of sin", an article of faith in the Apostle's Creed, was interpreted as referring to the "sentiment of charity" which we should manifest toward every one who has erred from the way of truth". On the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, fundamental in the Lutheran view of the means of grace, this New York catechism has this to say; "What profit does the worthy communicant derive from this sacrament? He hereby strengthens his attachment to his Lord and Savior, and his affection for his fellowmen, excites himself to new resolutions of holiness; increases his inclination and sense of his duty to promote the cause of Christ; sets a good example to those around; and renews his impression of the saving and comfortable doctrine of the death and resurrection of Christ".

There can be no mistake about the type of theology which this Socinianizing catechism represented. It was a skillful effort at popularizing an imported Rationalism, in the Lutheran Church in this country, and displacing

thereby the type of theology upon which the foundations of that church had been laid by Muhlenberg in the eighteenth century, and those who preceded his coming in the seventeenth century. Writing from the Princeton Theological Seminary to his father, Dr. John George Schmucker, in February 1820, after a visit to New York, and referring to this distressing situation in our church, Dr. S. S. Schmucker said: "The majority of the preachers are rank Socinians (Rationalists). He (Schaeffer) has very little intercourse with them, and wishes to continue in connection with our (Pennsylvania) Synod. He believes with me, that it is absolutely necessary to enact a rule in Synod, that every applicant must be examined in the presence of the whole Synod, in regards to his personal Christianity. We deplore the ignorance of many of our brethren in the ministry, as also of ourselves. He said, he was ready to send to Germany for books, and would ask nothing for his trouble. But I cannot write the hundredth part. I will only say, that we promised each other, that in reliance on God, we would do everything possible to promote the following objects: In general to labor for the welfare of our church, that a rule may be established according to which every applicant must be examined, in regard to his personal Christianity, that the Augsburg Confession should again be brought up out of the dust, and every one must subscribe to the Twenty-one Articles, and declare before God, by his superscription, that it corresponds with the Bible, not quatenus but quia, and we promise to do everything possible to promote learning among us". In view of the prevalence of such teaching, in the Ministeriums of Pennsylvania and New York, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and the early years of the nineteenth, it is not surprising that, when the General Synod was organized in 1820, it was not found practicable to place in the constitution of that body even the name of the Augsburg Confession.

Rationalism is the most recent, but not the least violent and insidious of all the developments of scepticism.

In some aspects of its erratic tendencies and influences, it passed over from the Lutheran Church in Germany to exercise a baleful and depressing influence in the church of our faith, in the days of its feebleness in this land. But even in those days, the robust Lutheranism of an earlier day showed itself to be capable of maintaining its identity and eliminating the leaven of that type of belief. It is a homely saying that the burned child dreads the fire. May it not be affirmed that our experiences with its paralyzing influences, at one period of our denominational history in this land, is at least one chief reason why, in our day, when other communions in our country are so widely infected by this old virus of rationalism, in all of our borders and divisions our schools, publications and churches, stand fast in the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

2. A second chapter in the erratic movements among us, in this country, I may name as the unreasoning hostility to what was known, for a considerable period among us, as "Symbolism", and the confusion so manifest in the use of that word.

There have been periods in our history in this country when that word, "symbolism", had a terrifying sound. Around it have gathered the detonations of high ecclesiastical battle. There was a time when loyal adherents of confessional documents, which the General Synod, as late as 1909, pronounced to be of great historical and interpretative value, were denounced as the, "resurrectionists of elemental, undeveloped, halting, stumbling and staggering humanity", as priests ready "to immolate bright meridian splendor on the altar of misty, murky dust", men who were bent on going backward and consequently and of necessity going downward.

The Evangelical Review, supposed at the time to be the special organ of the symbolists, suffered much in its subscription list in 1852. Some men returned the copies sent them. One Lutheran minister wrote that the publication was a curse to the church, alleging that it had dried up piety. Another affirmed that revivals had

ceased since the beginning of the publication, while another still insisted that it had extinguished vital godliness in the church. It may now be safely assumed that all fairminded and informed men of the church, in our day, will feel assured that these men, good and sincere as they no doubt were, took the matter too seriously, and were mistaken in their dread of symbolism and symbololatriy. This dreaded "symbolism" was accused of being an enemy of vital godliness and a depressing influence on the activities of the church. So unreasoning was this hostility that in 1853, before the writer of this article was born, it was declared in the *Evangelical Review*, of some parts of the Lutheran Church, in this country, that they stood in no more tangible relation to the historical confessions of the church than to the Koran of Mahomet. It was further declared that congregations were organized, synods were formed and ministers were licensed and ordained without the slightest reference to even the Augsburg Confession, the primary symbol of the Lutheran faith.

This hostility to "symbolism", as it was called, displayed itself in various ways and in varied forms of expression. In the early fifties, it was proposed to make additions to the greatly needed literature of the church in the English language, and a society was proposed and to be known as a "Translation Society". This proposal was laid before the district Synods for their consideration, and an example of the suspicion with which this innocent movement, which certainly never added much, if anything, to the volume of our literature, was regarded may be found in the following action of an Ohio Synod in 1855. "Inasmuch as an effort is being made in our Church to form a "Translation Society", to translate German Lutheran books of Europe into English; and whereas the German Lutheran Church of that continent has greatly degenerated from the pure, genuine, evangelical faith of our fathers; and hence a great majority of those books being tinctured, even poisoned by the so-called symbolic views, rationalism etc.; and as we

honestly think and fairly believe that such an effort would result in a tendency to incline many of the churches to turn to old Papal corruption, or at least injure the cause of God; therefore:

Resolved, That we, as a conference, with all the power and influence we possess, oppose such a measure; and suggest, where there is talent, piety, learning, and other means in our church to furnish us with books of a truly evangelical nature, let it be done and we will give them a hearty reception.

Resolved, That we honestly believe and acknowledge, that the great unerring principles of our Holy Religion are contained in the Holy Scriptures, a translation of which the immortal Luther has given us, and has recommended them in preference to all other writings; that, therefore, we view them as containing the true principles of genuine Lutheranism; and hence, that we will hold to them, as with a deathlike grip, to the end of time.

Resolved, That we also know and are sure that it is possible, according to the injunction of the Apostle, "To grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ", if we are to turn back from the light the church now has, to the symbols of the fathers, or even to all the views of Luther, who all had, when they were first written, just burst forth from Papal error, influence and superstition.

Resolved, That we cannot receive, less believe, in Baptismal regeneration, and the Eucharistic presence; because not in accordance with the Bible, the nature of things, no, not even with common sense.

Resolved, That we still, however, hold faithfully and immovably to the Augsburg Confession, in so far as we believe it to be, "substantially correct with the Holy Scriptures".

This astonishing action and effort to rebuke a very modest effort to bring the church back to her true historic standpoint, is susceptible of some analysis. 1. How good men, who had the most meagre knowledge of

movements, measures and words, ever could have placed in any sort of coordination the words "symbolism" and "rationalism" surpasses the writer of this paper, if no one else. If there is to be found in all the fields of theological literature any writings more destitute of rationalism than those contained in the Lutheran symbolical books, those writings have, like those destroyed in the burning of the Alexandrian library, passed entirely from the knowledge of mankind. 2. Regarding the manifest solicitude in this action about the primary place of the Scriptures, it needs only to be said that Lutherans, in any period of their history as a people, even in a period of much misunderstanding and radicalism, should have known that no writings of any period as clearly, forcibly and repeatedly affirm the place of the Bible as the supreme arbiter of Christian truth. It is hardly supposable that the people who first fought and vanquished the papacy, on this ground, should have reversed themselves and given allegiance to symbols made by men and embodying the same papal error, and which elevated themselves above the Scriptures which came to us through holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. It turns out upon examination, that, through their entire history, the people who have most confidently and consistently received these symbols as the expression of their faith, claimed authority for them only because they were a reflection of the correct teachings of the Scriptures. Much better than the statement on this subject contained in the synodical action, we have noted, is that contained in the Lutheran Formula of Concord, the latest of the symbols of that people, the one of the symbolical group that, at one time, was the object of the greatest suspicion. It is the Formula which says, "We believe, confess and teach that the only rule and measure, according to which all doctrines and all teachings ought to be judged, are no other than the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments—. Other symbols and writings do not possess the authority of a judge, which dignity belongs to the sacred Scrip-

tures alone; they only give evidence in favor of our religion or faith and explain it; and they show in what manner the sacred Scriptures were understood". 3 Certainly that resolution, that we "hold faithfully and immovably to the Augsburg Confession, in so far as we believe it to be substantially correct", whatever the attitude of that synod may be today, and we know it to be intelligently and pronouncedly Lutheran, its attitude in 1855 would not have precluded any Unitarian, Socinian, Arian, Pelagian, Romanist, Greek Arminian or Calvinist from finding ample and congenial shelter under its ambiguous ecclesiastical roof. 4. The intimation of the disastrous results of the "symbols" on the individual's "growth in grace" and the practical work of the church, was hardly warranted by the facts in the history of the Lutheran people and the example of many of the prominent men in the teaching and work of that body of Christians. Vital religion was not crushed and cold formalism induced uniformly among the, so-called, "symbolists". Adherence to the symbols did not have a deterring influence upon many of the recognized leaders in Lutheran history. That there was lukewarmness and formalism in the church then, as now, is indisputable. But in no single instance were these regretful features in the life of the church attributed to the confessions of the church, or was an amendment sought by their abandonment, recension or improvement. John Arndt was the author of the, "True Christianity", greatest among books of practical and devotional value. To these much suspected symbols no man adhered more rigidly and undeviatingly than did Arndt. At three different times did this godly and useful man publicly and solemnly subscribe to the symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and no man has yet risen up to affirm, that, in him, his subscription had proven fatal to evangelical religion and promotive of formalism. The history of such men as Arndt, the Gerhards, John and Paul, Spener, Francke, Schwartz and an innumerable host of others, refutes the implication that to accept, ad-



here to and revere church symbols makes men less holy, self-denying, devoted and energetic in the cultivation of personal piety and less successful in pushing forward the practical enterprises of the church.

The culmination of this confusion and dread of symbolism was reached in what certainly finds no parallel in the history of any other body of Christians in America, than our own. It was the proposal of what is known among us as the "Definite platform movement". As early as 1741, one year before the coming of Muhlenberg to this country, the Presbyterian Church had a split on confessional grounds, a split which Dr. Charles Hodge pronounced a "disorderly disruption". But neither of the parties to the split, old school or new school, ever proposed to make a recension of the Westminster Confession.

In 1855 the "Platform" made its appearance, an introductory note stating that it was prepared by the consultation and cooperation of ministers belonging to different eastern and western synods of the General Synod. It claimed to be in accord with the basis of that body, since it added nothing to the Augsburg Confession and did not omit "anything that has the least pretension to be considered a fundamental doctrine of the Scriptures."

The action taken by the synods approving of the Platform was as follows:

"The only errors contained in the Confession (which are all omitted in this recension) are:

1. The approval of the Ceremonies of the Mass.
2. Private Confession and Absolution.
3. Denial of the divine obligation of the Christian Sabbath.
4. Baptismal Regeneration.
5. The real presence of the body and blood of the Savior in the Eucharist.

With these few exceptions, we retain the entire Augsburg Confession, with all the great doctrines of the Reformation.

The other errors rejected in the second part of this

doctrinal Platform, such as Exorcism, etc., are not contained in the Augsburg Confession, but in the other symbolical books, and are here introduced as among the reasons for our rejection of all the other books except the Augsburg Confession.

At the same time whilst we will not admit into our Synod any one who believes in Exorcism, Private Confession, and Absolution, or the Ceremonies of the Mass, we grant liberty in regard to the other omitted topics, and are willing, as heretofore, to admit ministers who receive them as nonessential, and are willing to cooperate in peace and harmony with those who reject them, and to subscribe to this platform.

Therefore, Resolved, That this synod hereby avows its belief in the following doctrinal platform, including the so-called Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the American Recension of the Augsburg Confession, as a more definite expression of the doctrinal pledge prescribed by the General Synod's constitution for district synods, and as a correct exhibition of the scripture doctrine discussed in it; and that we regard agreement among brethren on these subjects as a sufficient basis for harmonious cooperation in the same church.

Resolved, That we receive the General Synod's Formula of Government and Discipline; contained in her hymn book, as our directory; and that any additions or alterations we may desire we will embody in by-laws, so that our beloved church may possess, and exhibit to the world, entire harmony in the reception of one doctrinal and disciplinarian platform.

Resolved, That we will not receive into our synod any minister who will not adopt this Platform, and faithfully labor to maintain its discipline in his charge."

According to the action taken in 1855 by one of the small synods that adopted the "platform", the reason assigned was that the entire Lutheran Church in Germany had rejected the symbolical books, as a whole, and had even, in the exercise of their liberty, abandoned some of the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession. The fact,

however, was not pointed out by this action, taken, either in ignorance of that fact or indifference to it, that these Germans who were engaged in this gratifying work of rejection were rationalists and not Lutherans of any order symbolical or unsymbolical. This work of rejection in Germany came from men who, in consequence of their negative teachings, had brought the church in that land into a most deplorable condition. It came at the hands of men, who coming with high sounding terminology, had invaded the sacred precincts of scriptural truth and had well nigh destroyed what was left of the Old Lutheran pietistic fervor. The allusion to these German disclaimers was, to say the least, not fortunate.

This unfortunate "platform", which was the culmination of the unreasoning hostility to "Symbolism" was endorsed, even in those days of looseness, by but few small synods. But one action after another taken, in the time immediately succeeding its appearance and meagre acceptance, clearly indicated an attitude still of mental uncertainty. The supposed definiteness of the platform did not, somehow, induce a feeling of definite certainty regarding the entire correctness of the document or the wisdom of the recession movement.

In the report of the president of one of the adopting synods, this double-headed recommendation appears: "Whereas, several sister synods have charged this body with rashness, and hasty action, in a matter of so great importance, and whereas we have had time since the adoption of said, "Platform" to see and feel, either the good or bad effects of our doing: Therefore I would recommend that if Synod believes it has done wrong in adopting said "Platform", then to recant their action, and if Synod believes it has done right, then to re-adopt the "Platform"; and recommend it for adoption by the churches within our bounds".

In the minutes of another synod this action appears: "Whereas, at our last convention this Synod adopted the "Definite Synodical Platform" as her future doctrinal

this body with hasty action, etc., and, whereas, some brethren who cordially reject the five errors specified in the platform, are not willing to subscribe to the same because it employs the language in the preamble, page five, "the only errors contained in the confession are", etc., therefore Resolved, That the phrase, "the only errors contained etc.," be changed to read, "the only errors believed by some to be taught in the Confession, and regarded by others as not contained in it, but which, whether taught or not, we reject are the following".

The action of that synod in those recension days does not indicate the unambiguous way in which the same body of today can express itself when occasion requires. "Resolved, That in adopting the Definite Platform,—the Synod adopted no new doctrinal basis, but only expressed what has always been their basis, and that, therefore, the statement upon which Rev. S. Ritz was received into the Northern Illinois Synod is incorrect, and that the action of that body in this case falls short of ecclesiastical courtesy".

The movement certainly reached the *reductio ad absurdum* in the action taken by a conference held at Monrovia, Kansas, in 1866.

"Resolved, That we organize ourselves into a synod on the basis of the Definite Synodical Platform, provided, Rev. Earhart will unite with us, and that if he does not we do not".

But in a day when many had forsaken the old paths and had become confused by confessional disclaimers and ambiguities, Rev. D. Earhart was too much of a Lutheran to be stampeded into the platform folly, and the Kansas brethren were saved from starting upon their synodical career, upon what soon was destined to be a "broken platform" for the existence of which no man has ever been able to present an adequate reason.

So far as the writer has been able to learn, the Platform was not more of a financial success than it proved to be in the field of confessional expression. Early in its history, in one of the approving synods, we find in the

proceedings this recommendation. "Your committee appointed at the last meeting of the synod, to publish the "doctrinal basis" has attended to its duties. One thousand copies have been printed and a part of them distributed, but there are still several hundred on hand. The publication cost \$24.00. Of this amount there remains a debit of \$14.00. Your committee recommend synod to liquidate the debt and release the committee".

That whole platform period in the history of the Lutheran Church is not only anomalous, but displays some of the most erratic and unhistorical features to be found in the annals of any body of Christians in this country. It seems to have been the infatuation of the great theological leader of the new school of "American Lutheranism", as it was called in that day, that the Lutheran Church in this land could be best established and built up, and best made to serve the kingdom of God, by the amendment of the Augsburg Confession; by a process of elimination, as he himself said, by, "Striking out all that is objectionable to any Protestant Evangelical Church retaining the remainder as the Protestant Confession".

The report of the delegates from one of its district synods, made to the General Synod in 1859, contains an analysis of the membership of that body at that time which, revealed the possibility of things that within a few years came to pass. This analysis of the several elements is as follows: "There are three elements in the General Synod: The extreme old, the extreme new, and the conservative Lutheran element. The last is the predominant one. These all appeared on the stage when the Melancthon Synod made application for admission into the General Synod. This application elicited considerable discussion, in which the extreme new and the conservative elements united against the extreme old element. The discussion was warm and continued a whole day, and, yet, manliness and a Christian spirit were maintained by all who participated in it. This is, perhaps, the first time in the General Synod's history,

that the two elements came into close contact with each other. We apprehended a very fierce contest when they met, but the spirit of Christ restrained these conflictive elements and kept them in the unity of the spirit and in the bond of peace. Of what peace if we all have the spirit of Christ".

It was in this period, also, that what was known as the Melancthon Synod, a body which had been organized out of the membership of the Maryland Synod, when that body had not yet completed a half century of its splendid history, came into existence. The writer of this article was confirmed in his boyhood in one of the churches connected with this synod and by a pastor who was one of its members, a man whose memory to this day is sacredly revered and honored. The new body was organized on the basis of what was called by one of its own members, that of, "Elective affinity". It never consisted of more than thirteen members, and they were in the same body not perforce of synodical boundaries of a geographical order, but purely from choice and voluntary selection. After a career of less than ten years it was disbanded, and its members drawn back into their true synodical orbit in the Maryland Synod. The basis of this body, so far as we know, has, in some of its features, no parallel in confessional writings. It declared, "But while we thus publicly avow and declare our convictions in the substantial correctness of the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, we owe it to ourselves and to the cause of evangelical truth to disavow and repudiate certain errors *which are said by some* to be contained in said confession: 1. The approval of the ceremonies of the mass; 2. Private confession and absolution; 3. Denial of the divine obligation of the Christian Sabbath; 4. Baptismal regeneration; 5. The real presence of the body and blood of the Savior in the Eucharist. With these exceptions, *whether found in the confession or not*, we believe and retain the entire Augsburg Confession with all the great doctrines of the Reformation". Certainly confessional declarations of the

halting, uncertain, and ambiguous order never surpassed what is indicated in such phrases as, "which are said by some" and "whether found in the confession or not". There was a striking absence of Luther's robust attitude, when he once remarked in his troublous day, "We have not said *mum*, and played our part in secret but here it stands, our clear blunt and free confession, given without reserve or crafty deceit".

It was during this period of confusion and groundless dread of symbolism that a synod was admitted to the membership of the General Synod on what was called a "declaration of faith" which was not only of dubious Lutheran integrity, but according to a decision rendered by a vice chancellor of the state of New York, not even of certain evangelical type. The "Declaration" was a negative importation from a rationalistic German University. According to the decision, not of an ecclesiastical court inquiring into the teachings of recognized heretics, but of a competent judge of a civil court, the declaration contained this classification of errors:

1. It does not maintain and declare the doctrine of the Trinity, or that the three Persons constituting the Godhead are equal in power and glory; or even that there are three Persons constituting the Deity.

2. It does not admit or declare the divinity of Jesus Christ or His equality with God the Father.

3. It does not teach or declare that men will be condemned to punishment in a future state, because of inherited or original sin, unless it be repented of; or that it condemneth all who are not born again of water and the Holy Ghost.

In this period of our denominational history in this country we encounter much indeterminate phraseology in many of our writings; an indeterminateness that has long since been eliminated from all our official declarations and recognized church literature. We are assured that "Our venerated Augsburg Confession is variously interpreted". In a synodical declaration as far back as 1837—nearly twenty years earlier than the Definite plat-



form, we are told that "The Evangelical Lutheran Church does not now materially differ from other Protestant denominations in this country". We are told by teachers of the church that while "The Augsburg Confession is our acknowledged Creed it is not received as to its every jot and tittle". In the act for the ordination of ministers adopted and used in one of our southern synods as far back as 1845, the candidate is exhorted "To live in harmony with your brethren, in peace with your fellow Christians in general and in goodwill towards all mankind" and similar good and commendable generalities, while there is no more allusion to any Lutheran Confession than to the Koran or the alleged revelations of Joseph Smith.

The outcome, however, of all this indefiniteness was not altogether bad. It served to stimulate to bold and intelligent assertiveness many who were not willing to throw away their compass, lose their way and abandon church treasures; which had been accumulated through generations of struggle for the truth.

"The principal effect of the Definite Platform" says the late Dr. Spaeth, "was to open the eyes even of the indifferent and undecided ones and to cause them to reflect". A storm of indignation burst against the perpetrators of this attack on the venerable Augustana. Many men who before were numbered with "American Lutheranism" and whose full sympathy with the movement was confidently expected, had nothing but stern rebuke for it. Of it the late Dr. John G. Morris declared "extremely un-Lutheran, unchurchly, and even rationalistic positions were assumed by some who defended the Platform".

3. Were we to pass to note another classification of certain kinds of ecclesiastical irregularities and repressive measures, we should find enough to make a large chapter drawn from synodical proceedings and other sources. Years ago, for example, some of our ministers, as the synodical proceedings prove, showed no small amount of a sort of insurgency which was the out-

growth of individualism and a perversion of what was much exploited as "Lutheran liberty". From the days of the Reformation that phrase among us has been a cherished heritage, but it must be confessed a heritage under the shelter of which source abuses have been fostered. It is a good and noble thing that is connoted by those two words, but good and safe only as subject to some self-imposed limitations. Years ago in this country "Lutheran liberty" manifested itself in some of its perversions in certain un-Lutheran practices and disregard of the rights of neighboring pastors as well as of synodical constitutions and regulations.

The older records of some of our synods show that some brethren fell to traveling in the wrong denominational orbit, and that at times they had to be called to account for the introduction into our churches of anabaptist views and practices. But examination proves that with such irregularities in teaching and practice, the men who had oversight of the church in that earlier day, and who gave direction to church affairs, dealt with firmness and Lutheran consistency. In the minutes of one of our synods for 1860 there appears this action. "Whereas, we are credibly informed that certain brethren of this synod have departed from the universal and exclusive mode of Baptism practiced by the Lutheran Church, in that they have immersed individuals presenting themselves as subjects of this rite, and whereas, we consider it essential to the purity of our Church that her distinctive features, both as related to doctrine and practice, should be preserved, and whereas, further, such departures from her usages have a direct tendency to produce irregularity and schism". In the proceedings of the next year we find a wholesome action called out by not only irregular practice but also threatened rebellion on the part of one of its members in the abuse of his alleged "Lutheran liberty". "There is one thing in his letter that yet merits attention. It appears

he has been influenced to immerse an applicant for baptism. We respectfully offer the following:

"Whereas the Brother accompanies the report of his irregularity with a threat of rebellion in his congregation against the action of Synod in case synod censures him, therefore

"Resolved, that in the administration of Baptism by immersion he has grossly violated specific regulations of this synod, and his course and conduct be, and hereby are heartily condemned.

"Resolved that he be suspended.

"Resolved, that congregations are under moral obligations to comply with the regulations of Synod, and that they are grossly irregular when they advocate or allow Baptism by immersion".

In the ancient usages of the Scotch churches of the Presbyterian order there was a custom as it was known of "Fencing the tables", by which usage was meant the careful guarding of the Holy Communion. As early as 1850 we find that one of our synods felt called upon to deal with certain irregularities that had grown up in connection with the observance of this sacrament. "Inasmuch as we are often imposed upon by persons from sister Churches, who are unbaptized, communing with us, therefore:

"Resolved, that we expressly state at such seasons, that all such persons cannot commune with us. Resolved, that we as a Synod require all applicants from other Churches to our ecclesiastical connection, to make themselves acquainted with the doctrines and usages of our Church, and that the President recommend suitable books for the acquisition of this knowledge."

Repeated actions occur in the earlier minutes of our synods also dealing with disorderly disregard of synodical and parochial boundaries. The men who tried to live in such disregard of synodical geography, and who were guilty of unfraternal raids into other men's pas-

torates in a fondness for fees and donations, were frequently warned in various synodical actions to "discontinue", and sometimes with an official admonition that worse might follow, in case of continued disregard.

Coming to the sphere of casuistry we find a variety of synodical judgments expressed on a variety of subjects. The question of the authority of conscience is an old subject. The nature of such a power, the rule of right or wrong, have been matters of endless discussion and of some strife. Our fathers shared in this interest and in some instances showed a tendency to take some things out of the sphere of liberty and place them in that of the law. As an example, early in our history we find that one of the synods went strong on the tobacco question, provoked thereto as it would seem, by the conduct of some of the reverend brethren within the courts of the synodical meeting. "Resolved", said they, "that we as a Synod regard the use of tobacco as a filthy practice, disgusting, and an annoying nuisance, and especially so in the House of God".

We find, as early as 1854, another of our synods making a distinction between attendance at the circus and the menagerie, it being regarded, one would infer from a synodical resolution, as morally permissible to see the elephant, the monkey and other beasts in the collection gathered from the ends of the earth, but not permissible to listen to the stale reflections of the clown or to gaze upon the gyrations of the bareback riding artist. A beneficiary student in one of our colleges, who later became one of our ablest and most distinguished preachers, was the occasion of this resolution. "Your committee would report a letter from Brother—in which he says that he, through deceptive bills, was induced to enter a circus instead of the menagerie, and coming to himself, he bitterly repented of his error, praying Synod to pardon him for this time; and he promises thereupon to avoid similar and all other offences in the future, God aiding him".

Let it not be supposed that such symptomatic displays of what may be classified as erratic tendencies and actions, were peculiar to Lutheran people. Others had such displays that at one time and another surpassed anything in our history. The Presbyterians had confessional problems and even a split one year before Muhlenberg came to America. Congregationalists, now broad and liberal for the most part, had controversies and disruptions over more attenuated theological and ecclesiastical problems than any that have vexed us. There were revolutionary agitations and changes among churches in the most ancient seats of Puritan and Pilgrim Christianity in this country. Divergent tendencies revealed themselves during and after the "Great Awakening", eliciting controversies in which Jonathan Edwards and Charles Chauncy were the leading protagonists. There were schools of opinion known as Old Calvinist and Hopkinsonian which drew more and more apart. In 1801 a schism took place in the old Pilgrim Church at Plymouth, the issue being the settlement of a minister of "liberal" sympathies. In 1803 there came a painful and disheartening blow to those who cherished the doctrinal traditions of the New England Churches in the election of Henry Ware to the chair of theology in Harvard College. The election of Ware and three others of the "liberal" or Unitarian complexion, which soon followed, announced to the "Evangelicals" that the influence of the College was thenceforth committed to the opposite side. The Episcopalians too had troubles long before any that invaded our ranks. In the year 1787 the old Episcopal Church of King's Chapel in Boston declared itself Unitarian in doctrine, amended its prayer book accordingly and inducted into its pastorate for minister, James Freeman, a man of pronounced Unitarian principles. Thus as was said, "the first Episcopal Church in New England became the first Unitarian Church in America". There were others who shared in similar experiences.

The question arises is there any discoverable warrant, especially for the confessional erraticisms and departures from historical Lutheran practice in the earlier periods of our denominational history in this land? The writer feels assured that, considering the history of other religious faiths in this country, it would have been remarkable had our people been left untouched and uninfluenced by some of the erratic tendencies we have noted. Considering the fact that religion is such a fundamental fact in human life, that it has to do with the finest and best things of which men are capable; and further that it has so frequently been infested with false guides, it is not surprising that differences have emerged even among the best of men, and that at every stage of the history of the Church some good men have made mistakes and separated one from the other. Religion is not even unaccustomed to the sight of her votaries turning upon her and saying, "We have been deceived" and upbraiding her, and saying that the path she has pointed out is nothing better than a sheep-track which neither leads onward or leads home. Men have not only separated and contended for their religion but have died for it as for no other order of life and conviction, political, social, or economic.

The unhistorical and un-Lutheran tendencies came in when as a people in this land we were weak and entirely overshadowed by other and much stronger expressions of Protestantism. In 1850 the Lutheran population of this country was less than 50,000, while in 1860 it was much less than the membership of a single synod now. This was the period of the "Definite Platform" and its unsuccessful abridgements and emendations. These men of the "Platform" type too, let it be remembered, came in contact with some men with a cold, rigid, loveless type of orthodoxism. They knew of sermons that were full of bitter polemics and of catechizing that was but a cold and formal exercise of the memory. They had come in some contact too with a repellant, polemical ex-

clusivism. It must be confessed that many of these men as well as their neighbors, in a day of destitution of denominational literature in the language of the country, did not know what true Lutheranism is, but in their time and place they were pious, devoted to the Lutheran Church, and in self-denial were laying the foundations upon which others could build more wisely.

There have been Lutheran historians, and some but recent, who have written history upon the manifest assumption of the denominational infallibility of the bodies with which they are connected. They may have escaped some of the errors we have noted, but have certainly displayed as much weakness on some other lines. We believe in much that such confess and appreciate their good works, but must be permitted to dissent from any assumption of Lutheran infallibility or impeccability. Even in the days of confessional looseness and the introduction of alien methods, the historical spirit was at work and more and more asserting its increasing power. Slowly and steadily there came over the church a feeling that the manifestations we have noted were erratic and that the confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church framed in a day of controversy and with their affirmations directed against what were at the time regarded as the peculiar dangers to which the faith of the Church was then exposed, after all, adequately expressed the truth of the Gospel and the faith of the Church founded upon that Gospel; that they constitute, after all perversions and attempted modifications, the noblest statement of Christian doctrine that had ever been given to the world. In a time of theological unrest, when the vital questions of religion are being subjected to debate and criticism, her growth has come with a return from any erratic tendencies to the more positive statements of her earlier days. In thus doing she keeps her faith with the past co-ordinated with loyalty to her Head and Master.

To everlastingly magnify, as some continue to do, the



errors and needful limitations of our denominational youth in this land, to continue to cultivate prejudice by constantly rehearsing some of the peculiarities of our state of tutelage, is to do injustice to ourselves, to history and to Divine Providence. In a more comprehensive faith and a larger charity the children should estimate the work of their fathers who laid the foundations.

*Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE VII.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER

(From the October 1919 Quarterlies).

Dr. B. B. Warfield in the *Princeton Theological Review* characterizes "Albert Ritschl and his Doctrine of Christian Perfection" as follows:—

In point of fact Ritschl therefore brings us back, for the essence of Christianity, to the repetition in His followers of just those simple elements of piety which are given originally in Jesus. His Christianity is just "the religion of Jesus". And the whole purpose of his main treatise would not be misleadingly described as an attempt to show that those conceptions pronounced by Lagarde "apostolical, not evangelical" are really "evangelical" as well as "apostolical", because "rightly understood" they mean nothing more than following Jesus in thinking of God as mere love, who has no intention of punishing sin, and therefore living no longer in distrust of Him, but in trusting acceptance of His end as our end. Like Jesus, and under the impulse received from Him, (through the community) we are to live in faith, humility, patience, thankfulness, and the practice of love in the kingdom of God. Doing so, we shall be divine as He, doing so, was divine. This is to Ritschl the entirety of Christianity: and this is at bottom just a doctrine of "imitation" of the religion of Jesus. \* \* \* \* \* This type of piety he endeavored to impress on the church as the substance of what it is to be a Christian. It was in its interests that he worked out his theology, and it was in its interest that he turned and twisted the teaching of the Scriptures and of the great Reformers alike, in the determination to wrest from their unwilling lips support for it. Nothing could exceed the eclecticism of his procedure,

except it be its violence. He takes from Scripture and Reformers alike what suits his purpose, without the least regard to its logical connection, and then fits it without mercy into his scheme. He himself naively betrays how he deals with the Reformers, for example, when he drops the remark: The reformatory ideas are more concealed than revealed in the theological books of Luther and Melancthon themselves. Neglecting their real teachings he gathered out from their writings such chance remarks as could be made to fit in with his own view of things, and built up from them a new Reformation doctrine which he presented as the only true one. Thus he gave the world a new Naturalism, decked out in phrases borrowed from the Scriptures and Reformers, but as like their system of thought as black is to white, and called it the true doctrine of the Bible and Reformers. This strange procedure has, under his influence, been systematized and men now tell us gravely that the essence of any movement consists of that in it which we can look upon as lasting truth—which, being interpreted, means that in it which we find conformable to our own predilections. In Ritschl's own hands it was rather the result of his overbearing temper, which imposed itself upon the materials of his thought and bent them to his service. So far as this, or something like this, is the true account of the matter, it is not necessary to attribute to him any direct purpose to deceive. The result was the same.

---

From an article on "Church Spires" by Bishop William A. Quayle, in the November *Methodist Review* we quote the following interesting paragraphs:

A church spire is the most spiritual thing man has contrived. It is therefore, the most poetical; for things spiritual are the highest form of poetry. Greek temples had no spires. Spires came with Christ. The irresistible poetry of him ran along the veins of men like sunlight until when they came to build a place of worship

out in the sunlight, far from the catacombs, unconsciously they flung their architecture into aspiration. A spireless church is an eyeless structure, having lost the essential spirit of what it is. Those structures which are built like a library-building, or a court of justice, or an opera house have lost the beat of the heart of ecclesiastical architecture. Men should not be tolerated as church architects who do not have in their own hearts the secret of God and the distillation through their plans of the mood of the gospel. This is a cardinal sin of contemporaneous church architecture. It has been secularized. In the name of something new they have imposed on the untutored in these fine spiritual atmospheres the grim spirit of utility that leads to the forgetting of God.

A church is the only thing of its sort on this earth. There are no kinsfolk to churches. They belong to the immortality of man, while all things substellar belong to the temporality of man. They die as man was thought to die before The Deathless came and wrought havoc with death. In the passion for utility, for modernity forsooth, for social rooms and serving rooms and the most modern Sunday school appliances, we have been led far and away from the sublimity which a church really is, and must remain if so be it shall retain its shining hold upon the life of the world. Utilitarian church architecture forgets central things—not matters of minutia, but a heart thing. A church is a reminder of man and a reminder of God and a reminder of both of them in the same breath; not man one time and God another time, but to think of both simultaneously and always so, as we think of summer and greenery, as we think of motherhood and tenderness, as we think of darkness and dew. As far as a church building can be seen it should remind him who sees it of his God.

---

Dr. L. Franklin Gruber in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* discourses concerning "The Creative Days". He says in part:—

The accounts of the first three days tell respectively

basis; and Whereas, several sister synods have charged of the creation or manifestation of light, of the establishing of the firmament together with the dividing of the waters below it from those above it, and of the separation of the waters upon the earth's surface from the land and also of the creation of plant life. There were thus two distinct creative acts on the third creative day. The accounts of the last three days tell respectively of the placing of lights or luminaries in the heavens with their appointments, of the calling into being of sea-animals together with winged creatures, and of the calling into being of land-animals, and also of the creation of man as nature's crown and lord. Hence there were also two distinct creative acts on the sixth creative day.

The first triad thus began with light and ended with two creative acts, the second one being the creation of life in its lowest form, in plants. The second triad began with organized light-dispensers and ended with two creative acts, the second one being that of the creation of the highest, psychic, life in man, God's image. Hence both periods began with light, the first with light diffused, and the second with light radiated from highly organized luminaries; both periods ended with life, the first with the lowest living organisms (plants) and the second with the highest organized life (man). And at least the latter of these creations, that of man as a living soul (i. 27; ii. 7), was a superadded act and manifestly a distinct and real creation *ex nihilo*, or an absolute creation, as the beginning of a new non-absolute entity,—as was also evidently that of living beings in sea and air. Hence the use of the word *bara* for these two creations (ver. 21, 27), even as for the absolute creation of primal matter (ver. 1). The account of the first triad, moreover, may be said to speak of God's work upon crude matter as the preparation for the beginnings of life, with which that triad was crowned and closed; the account of the second triad speaks of God's work upon matter in its higher organization and of the calling into being of the successive higher forms of life, crowning all with the life of the human soul.

Dr. David Foster Estes writes in the same Quarterly of the "*Divine Transcendence*", from which we quote the concluding paragraphs.

Lately we have heard little of the "Beatific Vision" and of all that this phrase suggests. Men, even Christian teachers, have scoffed at every aspiration beyond what this world might be made to satisfy. Perhaps now that we have learned that the world is still very evil, even if we do not go on to add that "The times are waxing late", men may learn that the soul has aspirations and needs that even a world made fit for democracy cannot satisfy; and they may think again the other-worldly thoughts that of late have been but a mocking, and will be glad again to sing,

"There grief is turned to pleasure—  
Such pleasure as below  
No human voice may utter,  
No human heart can know,  
And after fleshly scandal,  
And after this world's night,  
And after storm and whirlwind,  
Is joy and calm and light."

Yes, all this and more. Beyond every other promise and every other hope is one which we can hold only as we think of our Lord as divinely transcendent; and this promise and this hope beyond every other is that "we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is",—and

"Amidst the happy chorus,  
A place however low,  
Shall show Him us, and showing  
Shall satiate evermore."

Where in all the history of truth has there ever been a more perfect exemplification of the old apologue of the shield, on one side silver, on the other gold? Men have

wrangled because they saw but one side of the truth. God is both immanent and transcendent, "One God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all".

---

"The Philosophy of Prohibition" is presented in the same Quarterly by Dr. Chas. W. Super.

The rapidity with which the prohibition forces marched over the final stretch into the land where there should be neither beer nor distilled liquors has been almost marvelous when we consider the long period during which they were engaged in marshaling and training their forces. It was a notable case of *vires acquirit eundo*. It is the final stage of a process of evolution effected almost entirely through the enormous amount of literature placed before the public by friends of the reform. It has kept pace with the growth of democracy. It is an error to maintain, as so many of its opponents are wont to do, that a prohibition state is unnatural. Francis Lieber, the eminent German-American publicist, pointed out long ago that one state of society is no more natural than another; that conditions more or less artificial may be produced temporarily by force; but that such conditions are always transient. Yet even these can hardly be called unnatural. The prohibition movement was greatly aided by our entrance into the World War. But the acceleration was not wholly due to solicitude of those who remained at home for the welfare of the soldiers who went abroad: it was largely owing to the fear of being charged with pro-Germanism by their fellow citizens. For reasons both politic and political, many men voted for statutory prohibition who had no sympathy with it. The German-American Alliance which had for some time been the mouthpiece and protagonist of pro-Germanism in this country, had become arrogant, and its speakers had indulged in disparaging remarks upon almost everything American, especially upon prohibition. It had entered upon the project of forming an *imperium in imperio*, one of the fundamental principles of which was to be the unchallenged right of every indi-



vidual to drink without other restraint than that imposed by the individual will. It appears to have had no more doubt of success than had the Kaiser when he launched his great drives, westward, eastward, and southward.

---

Prof. James H. Tufts writes in the *International Journal of Ethics* of "Wartime Gains for the American Family" He concludes as follows:—

The Greek story of Agammemnon which told of the warrior disregarding family ties for military necessity, disregarding family morals under military thrill of power, and finally after his victories falling himself a victim to the passions of maternal love and conjugal jealousy, suggests in its outcome the issue of the duel between war and the family. War has disregarded the family under plea of higher necessity; it has habitually trampled upon many of the family sanctities; it has lowered birth rates and loosened marriage ties; it has often quenched in death the family life so happily begun. But now, what lies behind the insistent and compelling demand in all countries that this war shall be the last? What gives its deepest urge to that demand for a league of Nations and for international co-operation and justice, which the peoples of the world have so deeply felt? Not, I take it, so much that war is expensive, or irrational, or risky. Is it not chiefly this: That the family at last rises to avenge itself upon its ancient enemy and destroy it? This time, the first possibly in history, there is the chance that the family, like Wordsworth's Happy Warrior may turn its "necessity to glorious gain".

---

Dr. H. T. Andrews, London, Eng., discusses "The Legacy of Jesus to the Church" in the *American Journal of Theology*.

The greatest legacy which Jesus bequeathed to his followers was undoubtedly the legacy of himself. It was the transcendent personality of Christ that dominated not only his contemporaries but all the later converts in the

Apostolic age. No ordinary categories were adequate to describe the effect produced by Jesus on his hearers and followers. Even the title Messiah failed to convey all that he was to the men who knew him best. It is one of the greatest miracles in the history of thought that within thirty years of the crucifixion, by a daring leap of the imagination, the apostle Paul came to regard Jesus as the source and center and goal of the cosmic universe. And yet that audacious assertion seems to have been accepted on all sides without challenge or cavil, because in the experience of the church Jesus had proved himself worthy of the highest terms that thought could find to describe him. Everything else in the New Testament derives its value from the personality of Jesus. The ethical teaching is authoratative because it is the teaching of Jesus. The cross gains all its meaning from the fact that it was Jesus who died. From the very beginning Christianity was Christ. He is something infinitely more than the founder of a religion. He himself is the center and core of that religion.

Moreover, we must always remember that the legacy which Jesus bequeathed to the church in his own personality is not limited to his historical appearance in Palestine. The modern attempt to distinguish between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith is a false antithesis utterly unknown to the New Testament. The two conceptions are linked together by the fact of the resurrection. Faith in the living and eternal Christ is the natural implicate of the resurrection. Jesus bequeathed to the church not merely a great and holy memory but a living and abiding presence, not merely the thought of one who had "greatly lived and greatly dies", but the thought of one who was alive forevermore.

---

In an article in *Religious Education* on "The Church's Job", Dr. Durand Drake of Vassar College commends Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls and Girl Scouts and kindred associations. Dr. Drake must not be taken too seriously.

What is the secret of their success? First and foremost, they really interest the average boy and girl,—which is more than we can honestly say of church and Sunday-school. We may as well make up our minds to this: you cannot save unless you can interest. And the average boy, to be quite frank, is bored—or irked—in church or Sunday-school. He has to be pushed to attend, he gets little or nothing out of it. It is what his parents want him to be interested in, not what he is interested in. He has no share in its program, no opportunity to express himself in it. Jewish history (or pseudo-history), supposed acts of Christian apostles, exhortations of Christian missionaries to their infant congregations—all this is not only remote, but seldom gives him a vision of the sort of hero he really admires. This is partly due to the false atmosphere of the goody-goody which is created by tradition about these really red-blooded men. But, however that may be, these are not his natural heroes, and it is very difficult to make him give more than a languid attention to them.

On the other hand, the name "scout", with all the glamor of danger and endurance and skill that it suggests, the wearing of a khaki uniform, the romance of outdoors unfolded to him, the opportunities for developing skill in all sorts of alluring and useful ways—all this, and much more in the fascinating program of scouting, not only rouses and keeps the boy's interest, but keeps it in general at a pretty high pitch.

But to say that the boy is interested does not go far enough; the maintaining of the Scout code becomes his own interest. Whereas at church, or even at young people's devotional meetings the boy commonly is in the attitude of feeling that he ought to believe and desire this and that, in the Scout code he has what represents his own actual ideals. The great international Scout movement is his movement, he is part of it, and is proud of it. Instead of being exhorted, preached at, repressed, his own longing to be a good scout is enough. "A scout is trustworthy; a scout is loyal; a scout is helpful; a

scout is clean; a scout is cheerful; a scout is reverent" | The principle of "suggestion" is used in the adroitest way in this scout law, which is worth a thousand prohibitions. Boys are just as eager to be autonomous as grown ups; let them have a code that is their own code, and they will stick to it through rain and shine. They are far more sensitive to the approval and blame of their equals than to that of their elders. When they attain to the privilege of being a scout, and repeat the Scout Oath: "On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country and to obey the scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake and morally straight", they are not merely hearing what their elders want them to do, they are saying what they themselves want to do, and will to do.

---

*The Christian Union Quarterly* has an article by Alva W. Taylor on "The Rural Church and Christian Union" from which we quote, as follows:

That organic union is possible in only an occasional case is too patent to demand argument. In that matter we face a fact and not a theory. Theories can be argued and resolved but facts cannot. That the spirit of co-operation is becoming pervasive is apparent. Is there a way in which co-operation can be practiced so as to eliminate over-churching with its consequent weakness and effect an organic enterprise that will not compromise conviction? The federated church seems to offer that possibility. It leaves each group and each individual free to maintain any and all their traditional and personal loyalties. It need not disturb the overhead or denominational societies and conventions so long as the traditional sentiment in regard to them remains. It creates a church that accomplishes union in its own community but does not thereby cut off fraternal relations with all other churches through severing denominational ties without having set a new "union denomination". By uniting the local congregations it makes a resident pas-

tor possible and with him the strengthening of religious work in the community. It gives a larger motive for church activity through enthusiasm for a more definite community programme, the success of numbers and abler direction. It will make for longer tenures to the minister and procedure for the church and abler ministry. It will broaden the church programme from preaching once or twice a month in each of several churches in which the members are seldom more than mere listeners to a full programme of church work with services every Sunday, the organization of the young people and other classes, the promotion of sociability and of a benevolence that always comes by giving the people something more to challenge their generosity. It re-centers attention from the waning interest in sectarian programmes to the increasing interest in community welfare. By doing the will in regard to unity it will in time work our union. What we cannot procure by the revolution of ideal and immediate organic church union we can evolve through putting first things first and allowing them to work out their own fruitage in time and through the sound process of human nature. We cannot see all the process from the beginning. If we refuse to attempt anything until we can do so we will perish in doubt and inanity. By practicing unity we will learn the way to union.

---

"The Rising Tide of Social Unrest" by Dr. H. G. Moulton, published in the *Yale Review* has the following on Bolshevism.

Bolshevism, as a philosophy of social and political organization, is nothing new. With minor variations it is but Marxian socialism of the vintage of 1848. The spread of Bolshevism, however, is not to be attributed so much to a sudden increase in the number of intellectual adherents to Bolshevistic principles as to the social despair incident to demobilization, and its resulting unemployment, hunger, and lowered standards of living.

Lenin and Trotsky seized their opportunity when from

twelve to fifteen millions of war-weary and disheartened soldiers were thrown into an utterly stagnant labor market. The Russian economic organization had completely broken down under the strain of war. Counting on a short conflict, Russia mobilized her man power in unprecedented numbers, but almost entirely neglected financial, commercial, and industrial mobilization. Hence the end of the struggle for Russia was marked by a terrible prostration of industrial activities, which was rendered the more acute because the rest of the world remained at war.

The Bolshevik leaders made use of this great unemployment crisis with extraordinary cleverness. They promised everything. And the ignorant masses, feeling that conditions could not in any event be worse, lent a sympathetic ear to the glowing accounts of the peace and plenty that would follow the adoption of Bolshevik principles. Moreover, the Red Guard was largely recruited from the ranks of the unemployed. The choice to a demobilized soldier was unemployment and starvation—so far as he could see—or six hundred roubles a month, with housing accommodations and innumerable special privileges thrown in, as a member of the Bolshevik army. Who can say that from the standpoint of the individual facing starvation his choice was not a wise one—however, disastrous the consequences for society that might follow.

When a country is once started on the road of revolution, it becomes more and more difficult to restore political order and to resume the processes of economic production. Revolution always tends to further the disorganization of economic life; this increased disorganization serves to swell the volume of unemployed and to lessen the national production; and this in turn drives increasing numbers of people to extreme measures. Thus events move in a vicious circle of causation, until the very foundations of economic existence are undermined.

Affairs in Central Europe since the signing of the armistice have followed a course very similar to that in

Russia in 1917-18. And the world over, the ranks of Bolshevism are being recruited from among those who, assured of peace and prosperity with the ending of the war, find themselves instead without even the opportunity of working for a living. As Mr. Vanderlip asserted, after viewing at first hand the economic condition of Europe last winter, "Hunger can drive any man to Bolshevism".



## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROF. J. L. NEVE, D.D.

## ORGANS AND REPRESENTATION OF LUTHERANISM.

The chief literary organ for expression of theological thought among the Lutherans of Germany is the "*Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*" in Leipzig, founded by Luthardt. It is also the recognized organ of the international *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Konferenz* of which we shall have something to say below. Very valuable papers, written for the most part by German theologians, are published in this weekly of twelve pages. As a rule, these great theological discussions are running through a number of issues and are later published in separate print. Then there is a department for church news. Sometimes larger reviews of certain parts of the Church are given. Also a very brief survey of political events is appended. Every issue is prefaced by a devotional article which is always exceedingly fascinating because of its adaptation to the interests of theologians. This highly instructive paper is found on the desks of Lutheran theologians the world over. In connection with it, but as an independent publication, there comes the "*Theologisches Literaturblatt*", edited by Prof. Ihmels. It is known for its strictly critical reviews of current theological literature. The publication house for both papers is "Doerfling and Francke in Leipzig".<sup>1</sup> These two papers, together with the "*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*" (a monthly), published by the Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung in Leipzig, are the chief representatives of the so-called "Modern Positive School of Theology", in Germany and the Scandinavian countries. Among the contributors are names such

<sup>1</sup> The price for the *Kirchenzeitung* is Marks 5 and for the *Literaturzeitung* Marks 3.50, quarterly. Counting the Mark at two cents and less it can be seen that it does not cost much to secure these two great standard publications of Lutheranism.

as Ihmels, Schaeder, Walther, Gruetzmacher, Stange, Kaftan, Kropatscheck, Althaus, Boehmer, Hilbert, Zahn, Bachmann, Kunze, Bard, Scheele and many others. A few great men of this school have passed away recently: the O. T. exegete Klostermann of Kiel, the N. T. exegete Wohlenberg of Erlangen, the church historian Hauck of Leipzig and Bishop von Bezzel of Munich. Two men should be mentioned, who have not entirely identified themselves with the confessional and the church interests of this school, but who have done much faithful research for Lutheranism: Prof. Kawerau of Berlin, who died recently, and Prof. R. Seeberg of Berlin. Both belonged to the middle group, or the Union. The "modern positive school" can be best characterized when we say that it is a continuation of the positive schools of Lutheranism, that came into being as a reaction against Rationalism and the Union, in the second third of the nineteenth century, and was represented by men such as Sartorius, Rudelbach, Guericke, Harless, Thomasius, Philippi, Th. Harnack, Caspari, Kurtz, Kliefoth, Vilmar, von Zezschwitz, Oehler, Hofmann, Delitzsch, Kahnis, Luthardt, Zoeckler. This school rejects evolution "as a process of nature", its application to the Old Testament and other fields of theology. It establishes itself upon revelation in the pre-existing Christ, modifying however the old conception of Scripture inspiration, a subject on which it has assimilated essential elements of the former Erlangen School. Guided by conservative tendencies, concessions are made to the modern world-view where this can be done without conflicting with the supernatural principle of revelation. The school shows its thorough scientific and modern character by employing the historical method in all theological work. As to the heritage from the reformation its theologians throughout accept the confessions of Lutheranism, aiming to develop their "modern-positive" theology in harmony with the principles of these confessions, historically interpreted. Those in our country who believe that all theology in Germany is liberalistic and radical are certainly much

mistaken. Theological liberalism in Germany, it is true, can claim strong men and has many followers. But we have been informed that during the war the internationally known and widely read organ of German theological liberalism, the "Christliche Welt", has ceased to exist, while the above mentioned organs of positive theology have all survived.

At another time we may take occasion to review and to characterize the other schools of German Protestantism. In this issue we cannot do it for lack of space, especially because we mean to speak of recent developments.

#### RECONSTRUCTION OF THE RELIGIOUS SCHOOL IN GERMANY.

Up to the revolution in Germany, religion was taught in all the public schools, the lower and the higher. In Lutheran provinces it was done on the basis of Luther's Catechism, the Church Hymnal and the Augsburg Confession. Where the Reformed Church was strongly represented either the Heidelberg Catechism was used or a Union catechism which represented a blending of Luther's Enchiridion and the Heidelberg into one book. In many localities, it is true, this religious instruction in public schools was much affected by liberalism, because teachers like theologians, had turned away from the old faith. There were liberalistic teachers' associations. This teaching of religion in the public schools was under the superintendency of the Church.

The National Assembly at Weimar, in the constitution for the new republic, separated the Church from the state. But when the first minister of education (Hoffmann) proceeded by a decree to eliminate religious instruction from the schools there was a powerful demonstration of protest from the parents and church people. Herr Hoffman had to vacate his seat and another more conservative man was called. But according to legislation there will be from now on three kinds of public schools: (1) *Simultanschulen*, that means schools in which children of various beliefs will receive very gen-

eral religious instruction, we judge a kind of general ethics prefaced perhaps by some religio-philosophical thoughts on divinity, immortality etc. Such instruction, naturally, will have to be kept so general that even Jews and Heathen can take no offense. (2) The religious instruction may also be confessional so that each faith will have its own teacher (*Konfessionsschulen*). But the new law states that such confessional instruction cannot be regarded as an organic part of the whole school curriculum and life. And in order to have the right to demand a confessional school a majority of parents and guardians must have cast their vote for it. (3) There may also be schools with no religion. It seems that by the state (which is socialistic) the *Simultanschule* is looked upon as the rule. The church people are very active to secure the confessional school. The socialistic circles and free-thinkers of all kinds are just as active in opposing confessional instruction in the schools.

In later issues of the *Quarterly* we shall continue to report on the further development of this most vital and interesting conflict. Before dismissing the matter for this time we quote, first, an expression of the Allg. Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung, which attracted our attention: "*Without a truly religious instruction of the young we lose the foundation and the right for infant baptism*". This is very well said and we quote again the following resolutions with were passed by a convention of school teachers who had pledged themselves to positive-Christian standards: (1) We reject the *Simultanschule* as the rule for public schools. (2) We protest against any oppression of the freedom of faith and conscience of parents and educators in the matter of religious instruction in the school. (3) Even in the existing so-called confessional schools we cannot anymore see a sufficient protection against religious instruction which is at variance with the faith of the Church because of the absence of supervision by the Church. Therefore we insist upon the establishment of schools which are an ex-

pression of religious freedom, in order to arrive at an institution for religious instruction founded upon the Scriptures. (4) Here we call upon all positive Christians, particularly upon their representatives and leaders, to give their energetic support to the guarantee of a truly Biblical education of the baptized children.

#### CONVENTIONS FOR CHURCH RECONSTRUCTION.

A number of such conventions were held during the month of September last year.

One was the "*Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchentag*" (German Evangelical Church-Day) which met in Dresden. It was presided over by Dr. Moeller of Berlin, the president of the Evangelischer Oberkirchenrat, the highest government of the Prussian Church Union. So it was an inter-church convention, not Lutheran, not Reformed, not outspoken liberalistic, but "evangelisch". It is difficult to find in English a term to express this adjective which is usually translated "evangelical". It does not however connote what is understood in English by Evangelical, namely a positive attitude to fundamentals such as belief in the doctrines of Trinity, the divinity of Christ, His atonement, the inspiration of Scriptures, miracles, etc., because Ritschlians and evolutionists were represented in this convention. Perhaps the term "Protestant" brings us nearer to the meaning of "Evangelisch" in the name of this convention. It was a representation of German Protestantism as it is composed to-day. Prof. Ihmels was present and gave a lecture, a testimony on the Gospel. The Methodists sent an address of greeting. The Leipzig "*Kirchenzeitung*", commenting favorably in the main upon the work of this convention, deplors that there could be no confessional expression, and, in a later issue (January 2, 1920), it remarks: "Here they all sat together, the theologians of revelation and those of the evolution, the believers in the Bible and those who reject the Scriptures. And they sat peacefully together". We are, of course, familiar with

what is said and may be said in favor of such a convention at a time like this when over against a socialistic state, in which the Roman Catholic Church is straining every nerve to secure its ante-Reformation position in Germany, the very existence of positive Protestantism is endangered. The Jesuit press is rejoicing in utterances like these: that the time is approaching when "lost territories can be regained" and the Church of the Reformation is characterized as "beaten and crushed". Neither do we believe that the most radical elements of Protestant radicalism were represented at Dresden, nor that they had a decisive influence. The Kirchentag stood for "confessional" religious instruction in the schools and for the right of foreign missions. Yet we feel that a few critical remarks are here needed. We read that it was a chief interest of the Kirchentag to stand for the rights of the Church against the state and to protest against any interference of the states with the reorganization of the Church in the various territories. But a glance at the program as published in the *Allg. Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung* (Sept. 12, 1919) and a reading of the leading address by Dr. Veit, the bishop of the Protestant Church in Bavaria (preeminently Lutheran) convinces us that much more is planned. While assurance was given that no "Reichskirche" is intended yet the fact remains that by a unanimous vote the Kirchentag was made a permanent institution, that "foundations are to be laid" for a church organization (*Zusammenschluss in neuen Formen und mit erweiterten Zuständigkeiten*). Dr. Veit, the successor of Bezzel, actually expressed the hope that, upon the foundations of this initial convention of the Kirchentag, this temporary structure would develop into a completed house. So it is to be a kind of a confederation of "the entire German Protestantism", which is to be aided and supported in "all the fields of its activity" (*auf allen Gebieten seiner Lebensbetätigung*). Each territory and church, however, maintains its own confessional independence and characteristics. The Kirchentag wants to represent the churches in its

relation to the world (*nach aussen*). But when we examine the details of the work with which the *Kirchentag* is charging itself, we are at once convinced that for such work a common confession is indispensable. Care is to be taken of the brethren of the faith in the diaspora, of the congregations outside of Germany that have suffered from the war, of congregations which by the treaty of Versailles have been severed from Germany, of congregations also to be formed among those that now must emigrate. Such care is to be directed from one "centre", we read. The "safeguarding and oecumenic assertion of the ethical-religious world-view of the Evangelical churches of the German Reformation" over against influences from the outside also belongs to the program; also the promotion of a united development of the territorial churches with regard to organization (congregation and synod), to the office of the ministry, to the problems of religious instruction and theological education, to the development of inner mission, social service and evangelization. How can all this be done by a confederation which lacks the bond of a common Confession?

We add a few things that are characteristic of this *Kirchentag* in Dresden. In the opening address by Dr. Moeller the statement was made that the German people had received rich blessings from the co-operation between Church and state: "The Church owes a deep gratitude to the princes, and such gratitude will live among the German people." Without denying that certain blessings have come from the co-operation between Church and state, yet from the standpoint of the Lutheran Church the disadvantages have by far outweighed the advantages.<sup>2</sup> Concerning Church Construction the opinions seemed to have been divided. But the emphasis was upon a "people's church" under all circumstances,

<sup>2</sup> Compare our pamphlet "The Free-Church System as compared with the State Church." Luth. Literary Board, Burlington, Ia. See also the third chapter of our series of articles on "The Union Movements" in *uLth Quarterly*, April 1919, pp. 201ff., 213-226; also the fifth article Oct. 1919.



without insisting upon the "confessional church" as the *conditio sine qua non*.

With this last criticism we have already characterized the difference between the Evangelischer Kirchentag and the convention now to be discussed, the "*Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Konferenz*" which met in Leipzig, also in September, immediately after the Kirchentag. Prof. Ihmels has been for years the presiding officer over this conference of representative Lutherans. There was always an international stamp upon this convention.<sup>3</sup> Churchmen from the Scandinavian countries and from America always participated. The commissioners of our National Lutheran Council were present at this meeting. There were also visitors from Sweden and the Baltic provinces. Between three and four hundred non-residents of Leipzig had come together. The theological faculties of Erlangen, Goettingen, Greifswald, Rostock and Leipzig were represented. Prof. Boehmer of Leipzig read a paper on "Luther as Standard-bearer of the Believers in Christ", Prof. Hilbert of Rostock on "Peoples' Church and Confessional Church". A prominent Swedish theologian (Oesterlin-Upsala) presented a special study on Luther. A Baltic pastor, Rev. Schabert of Riga, a man who had already been marked by the Bolsheviks for execution and saved only in the last moments by a wonderful providence, gave a touching account of the "Martyrdom of the Baltic Church". Another paper by a professor of Jurisprudence was on "Fundamental Outlines on the Reconstruction of the Church". Dr. Cordes, formerly pastor at Mary Drexel Home in Philadelphia, now in Leipzig, spoke on "The Lutheran Church and the Training of the Young", Prof. Kunze of Greifswald on "The Lutheran Church and the Social Problem". All these papers have been or are published in the Allg. Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung.

Here at Leipzig the motto was: The Church must be, first of all, a "Confessional Church", with the definite

3. Compare October issue (1919) of Lutheran Quarterly, p.551.

message of the Gospel as interpreted by the confessional testimonies of the Lutheran Reformation. But with this message it must be as much as possible a "People's Church". The Church must try to hold all who are willing to remain under her influence. Kaftan declared: "If the Peoples Church cannot be decidedly confessional then we must stand for the Confessional Church".

On the discussions regarding the German mission fields, concerning which conference was held with the commissioners of the National Lutheran Council, we shall have something to say in the April issue of the *Quarterly*.

---

Next comes the "*Lutherischer Bund*" which met in Hermannsburg, almost contemporary with the Kirchentag. Here we have a confessionally stricter group of Lutherans than that which a few weeks later was assembled at Leipzig. The *Lutherischer Bund* originated from a protest of these Lutherans against the admission of the Lutherans of the Prussian Union into the Allg. Luth. Konferenz, some fifteen years ago. This Bund is composed of those Free-Church Lutherans in Germany that came into existence in the middle of the last century as a result of the conflict of confessional Lutheranism with the endeavors of the Prussian State to introduce the Union. There were six larger and smaller bodies which have recently united into one confederation. But a number of State Church ministers are also in the *Lutherischer Bund*.

At this convention, the discussion of a paper by Dr. Haccius on "The Evangelical Lutheran State Churches in the Hour of their Decision" led to the resolution: "The Church, freed from the state, must be a confessional church, because such a church alone can become a real people's church; such a church alone can bring about a reconstruction and will prove to be a victorious factor in the struggle with anti-Christian infidelity, with Romanism and with the Reformed influences of Anglo-American origin". In the general resolutions it was de-

clared: Now the hour of testing has come for the Lutheran state churches of Germany. It is to be revealed whether they are willing to establish themselves as confessional churches, in harmony with Art. VII of the Augsburg Confession, or whether they will choose to hold their former constituency in order to be first of all a people's church, but at the cost of sacrificing the Confession. Earnest warning was given against all the endeavors to unite people of various beliefs into one church by employing ambiguous confessional formulas. Pointing to the hour of history the plea was made to let the whole reorganization be determined by absolutely no consideration but the Word of God and the confessional experience of the Church. Hope was expressed that now the Lutheran Churches of Germany, freed from the state, would see their way clear to unite with the existing old Free-Churches. Regarding the religious education of the Baptized children it was declared that no religious instruction could satisfy the Church except a confessional teaching under the supervision of the Church.

To complete the list of conventions that were held last September in Germany we shall close with a report of the essential features of the program of the "*Friends of Evangelical Freedom*", who represent the men that are laboring to put the academic liberalism of Germany's universities into practice. Prominent in this group is Prof. Baumgarten of Kiel. Here are their principles: (1) We see in the Gospel of Jesus and in the forces of the Reformation the foundations of our religion, but we know that every age has to render its contribution to a deeper conception of religious thought. We want a religion that does not stand beside life, but which, in ever growing degrees, strives at comprising and permeating life itself with all its moral and physical powers. (2) Such religion cannot be fully comprehended by man's reason and cannot be defined in formulas. We want a Church, therefore, in which it is admitted that every individual is accountable to himself for his convictions, and where people of like belief may unite in special re-

ligious societies, but which, as a church, refuses to draw up a common creed. . . . (3) We want a church which grants full freedom of conscience . . . . . (4) We want a church which respects the full realm of science, a church which does not keep the congregation ignorant of its results, a church which is in living touch with the intellectual life of the people; a church at the same time, which does not in the least permit herself to be turned away from eternal religious truth by the tendencies of the age. (5) We want a free evangelical people's church which is to comprise all church bodies of the German people. It is to be free from the state and to be neutral regarding all political parties. Everything within this church is to be done for the people and through the people. (8) All ministers are to have like titles and like rights. As to their convictions they are to be under no authority. There shall be no heresy trials. (9) . . . . . There shall be no obligation to use perikopes and forms for prayer. (11) We stand for the right of religious associations to have non-theologians as preachers and for the administration of the Communion . . . . . (12) We want religious instruction in the public schools without supervision of the Church.

We mentioned Prof. Baumgarten as a champion of this group. Traub of Berlin, Heydorn, of Hamburg might also be mentioned. Another representative is Prof. A. Drews of Karlsruhe, who is again traveling from city to city in Germany, trying to prove in lectures that Jesus never lived.<sup>4</sup>

We shall frequently have occasion to quote characteristic utterances from this camp.

*Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, O.*

<sup>4</sup> A thorough refutation of Drew's lecture has just been published by Prof. J. Leipoldt-Leipzig.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. NEW YORK.

*The Lutheran Church and the Civil War.* By Charles William Heathcote, A.M., Ph.D. 12mo. Cloth. Pages 160. Price \$1.50.

Dr. Heathcote deserves great credit for this careful study of one of the most important periods in the development of the Lutheran Church in this country. The discussion is not confined entirely to the years indicated in the title. The first three chapters deal with the history of the Church previous to the Civil War especially as affected by the slavery agitation which preceded the war. The fourth chapter treats of the Lutheran Church in the North during the war, and the fifth of the Lutheran Church in the South during the same period. Then there is a chapter on the Lutheran institutions and the war, and a closing one on the Lutheran Church since the war, bringing the history down to the great Merger meeting in New York in November 1918.

The author has evidently made a very thorough study of the several topics discussed. Wherever possible he has gone back to the original sources for his material. An extensive bibliography at the close of the volume and a carefully prepared index add much to its value. There is also an informing "Introduction" by Professor Russell Alden, Ph.D., of Washington, D. C.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The God Juggernaut and Hinduism in India..* By Jeremiah Zimmerman, D.D., LL.D. Cloth. Illuminated Cover. 5½x8. Pp. 319. Price \$1.50 net.

This very readable story of Hinduism, told by Dr. Zimmerman from personal observation was reviewed by the *Quarterly* five years ago. Its popularity is attested by the fact that a third addition has appeared.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE AUGSBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

*From Army Camps and Battle Fields.* By Gustav Stearns, Captain-Chaplain 127 Infantry, 32nd Division A. E. F. 8vo. Pages 282. Price \$1.25.

The author of this book is one of the many young Lutheran pastors who responded so promptly to the call for religious leaders for our army when America entered the great World War. He was at that time in charge of the Church of the Ascension in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, which granted him leave of absence during the war. He was in the service nearly two years and had a rich and varied experience in the training camps in this country, on the transports going to and returning from France, and on three battle fronts "over there", as also with the Army of Occupation along the Rhine after the signing of the Armistice. He was wounded in one of the engagements while ministering to wounded and dying soldiers and burying the dead, and received most honorable citation by General Pershing for gallantry in the discharge of his duties. As an illustration of his fidelity the publishers state that he "buried fifty one fallen soldiers in one day on the battle-field, under shell-fire".

The volume is made up of weekly letters written to his church and its several organizations during his absence. As they were not written with any thought of publication they have all the freedom and personal touch of such a correspondence. They are full of interesting details such as might be expected under these circumstances. They are now put into print in compliance with the request of hundreds of soldiers and civilians who read or heard them as they were received from time to time.

There are 76 letters in all, and the book contains also 67 illustrations. Most of these are reproductions from photographs presumably taken by the author himself.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

*Occasional Sermons. Vol. I.* Collected and Edited by Rev. L. H. Schuh, Ph.D. 8vo. Cloth. Pages 606.

Dr. Schuh has done a fine piece of work in the preparation of this volume. It contains 58 sermons, contributed by 30 different ministers. At least four or five of the general bodies of Lutherans in America are represented.

Among them are the Synodical Conference, the United Lutheran Church, the Joint Synod of Ohio, with which the editor himself is connected, etc.

The sermons are classified under the following heads, Ordination, Installation, Corner Stone, Dedication, Patriotic, Reformation, Anniversary. There are also a number of sub-divisions under some of these heads. For example, under the general term Dedication, there are sermons for the dedication of a Church, of an Organ, of an Altar, of a Parochial School Building, of a Cemetery, etc.

These sermons are, of course, not intended to be appropriated and used bodily by other ministers for the purposes indicated in the titles. This would be rank plagiarism and would be a very dishonest performance. No true minister of Jesus Christ could be guilty of such a thing. It would be unthinkable and inexcusable. They are designed only for suggestion, and properly used in this way they may prove very helpful, indeed, to busy and hard-driven pastors.

The publishers deserve much credit for the fine style in which they have put out this volume. The type, press work and binding are all in the very best style of the printer's art. A second volume is in course of preparation and will be published in due time, under the same title, and containing sermons for still other occasions not covered in Volume I.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. NEW YORK

*Evangelism in the Remaking of the World.* By Bishop Adna Wright Leonard. 12mo. Cloth. Pages 197. Price \$1.00 net.

This volume comprises a series of six lectures delivered before the students of the University of Southern California, in February 1919. As the lecturer explains in the "Foreword" they "do not deal specially with plans for evangelistic work, but rather with that which is of greater importance—the stating of those principles that are fundamental to all evangelism".

This makes the volume all the more valuable. As the author suggests, principles are more important than plans. They are more vital and far-reaching. If the Church and the ministry are guided by sound principles,



they will find it a comparatively simple thing to devise plans that will be adapted to the needs of each special case or activity. In the absence of such guiding principles very serious mistakes are likely to be made in both aims and methods.

The several topics discussed are, "The Preacher and Evangelism", "Evangelism and Young People", "Evangelism in Church Music", "Evangelism in Social Service", "Evangelism in the Sunday Night Service", and "Safe-guards of Evangelism". Special emphasis all through is laid on those phases of the several topics which have a bearing on the problems which arise in connection with and are forced upon the Church and ministry by the new era that has followed the close of the great World War, and the return of the millions of young men who saw service during the war.

There is only one point at which we would feel obliged to take issue with the author in his discussion. This is in connection with his insistence on the necessity of a crisis conversion for the beginning of the Christian life. After speaking in sharp condemnation of what he calls "educational evangelism" as taught in Bushnell's great book on Christian Nurture, he says, "So far as I have been able to discover, the theory of educational evangelism makes no provision for the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion. The glaring defect in all such teaching is that there is no place for a spiritual crisis. This I hold to be absolutely essential and positively biblical. It does not matter how favorable may have been the accident of birth, nor how morally clean and pure the life has been, every one must come to the place where he consciously and purposely turns away from the sin and evil of the world and accepts Jesus Christ as his personal Savior".

If the Bishop only means by this that in the development of a normal Christian experience there will always come a time when the soul reaches for the first time a clear and definite realization of his saved relation to God in Christ Jesus, or a more clear and definite realization of this than he has ever known before, then we would make no special objection. But we would still want to add that in every growing Christian experience there will likely be many such spiritual crises. But if the Bishop means, as he seems to mean, that in every case prior to such a "spiritual crisis" the child, or young person, is a sinner and is under the condemnation of the law and exposed to the wrath of God, and that he only

becomes a Christian in or through this "spiritual crisis", then we would have to differ with him entirely. Too many of the best saints that the Church has ever known have testified out of a most rich and joyous experience that they were Christians from their earliest childhood, and that they never knew a time when they did not love the Lord Jesus Christ.

As for the charge that "educational evangelism makes no provision for the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion", we would commend to the Bishop's study Luther's explanation of the Third Article of the Apostles' creed, "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to him; but the Holy Ghost has called me through the gospel, enlightened me by his gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in the true faith; in like manner as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and preserves it in union with Jesus Christ in the true faith".

We were especially pleased to find in the chapter on the "Safeguards of Evangelism" the following strong condemnation of professional evangelism "The Christian Church simply must set herself steadfastly against those evangelistic movements, the chief purpose of which is to enrich the 'professional evangelist' under whose leadership the 'campaign' is conducted. There is too much wild-fire evangelism for the Church to be careless at this point. Large numbers of free-lance evangelists roam over the country building up personal fortunes at the expense of the Church. Many of them would command very small salaries in the pastorate. They are cheap imitators of those men who are really called of God to be evangelists and who do accomplish a great work. They are usually extremists, who pride themselves on their vulgarity and who boast of the unusual, undignified, and unbecoming methods employed by them for 'getting the crowd'. These are they who bring the fair name of the Church into disrepute and cause the sinful and godless to scorn the profession of Christian people".

We desire to quote one more paragraph with the most hearty approval in which the Bishop insists on the duty of the Church to keep her institutions of learning clearly and definitely Christian. He says, "There is no denying the fact that during the past quarter of a century the educational system of America has felt the blight of German rationalism. Large numbers of our most eminent

scholars have gone to Germany to pursue their studies and for research purposes. They have returned in many instances thoroughly committed to the German school of destructive criticism. The entire educational system of America has felt the effect of this, and the denominational schools have by no means escaped. Not infrequently has it been true that teachers have been employed in Christian institutions of learning who have made no profession of religion at all, others have been merely nominal Christian, while still others have exerted an influence over students that has been utterly destructive of faith. It is nothing less than a betrayal of trust, for Christian institutions of learning to employ as teachers those who are opposed to, or unsympathetic with, Christian teaching and doctrine". These words of warning are especially needed if we are to accept as reliable the reported results of an investigation recently made by Professor Leuba of Bryn Mawr to the effect that "of the more eminent teachers of the youth of America only twenty-seven per cent. believe in the existence of God, and but thirty-five per cent. believe in the immortality of the soul".

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Social Evolution and the Development of Religion.* By Carl R. Mahoney. 12mo. Cloth. Pages, 204. Price \$1.00 net.

In a brief Preface the author states his aim in the preparation of this volume thus, "The purpose of the study is to trace the relation between the development of society and the development of religion, that light may be thrown upon the relation of religious and social questions of the present time. It goes forward on the assumption that human life is continuous, carrying results from the past into the present and preparing a way for the future".

There is also in the Preface a brief apology for, or defence of, the men who are seeking to find a basis for religion, or an explanation of its origin and nature, by the study of psychology, or of sociology, or of both combined in what is coming to be known as "social psychology", and who in the prosecution of their work seem entirely to ignore the supernatural element which we find in revealed religion and in the Christian Scriptures. He says, "Much is said that is underserved against the religious psychologist for devoting so little attention to the

supernatural. An attack of this sort is due to an ignorance of the meaning of psychology or a thoughtless disregard of the scope belonging to it. The psychologist in the field of religion does not discuss the supernatural at length because it lies without his province. It lies in the realm of the theologian. The psychologist deals only with human nature, and when he discusses religion he is shut up to its human nature". This may all be true, but it does seem strange that men who profess to believe in the supernatural, and in a supernatural religion, should spend so much time and effort in trying to find an explanation of religion that has no place for the supernatural.

The volume comprises seven chapters with these titles, The Social Nature of Man, Factors in Socialization, Social and Individual Aspects of the Development of Religion, Social Evolution and the Development of Christianity, The Social Teaching of Jesus, The Practical Significance of the Social Side of Religion, and World Conflict and Reconstruction. These titles also give a fair suggestion of the general scope and spirit of the discussion. Though the supernatural element in Christianity is not emphasized for the reason indicated in the Preface as quoted above, Christianity is recognized as "the supreme religion", and as "destined to become the universal religion". While it had its background in Judaism, and was affected more or less in its development by Greek and Roman influences, it really "began with Jesus Christ" and "out of his personal life came the determinative dynamic elements and factors of the Christian religion and its development".

As to the fundamental question on which the psychologists of religion divide, whether religion is individualistic or social in its origin, our author seems to take a middle ground. He maintains that it was neither the one nor the other exclusively, but rather a combination of both. He says that "the social origin of religion is not a necessary assumption of functional psychology, and the origin of religion is no more social than individual in its nature. Religion is a fact of the evolution of the human personality, and is both individual and social in its nature. It is just as proper and as logical to speak of the religious aspect of social development as it is to speak of the social aspect of religious development. Society may just as truly be spoken of as religious as religion may be spoken of as social".

Of the effect of the war on religion the author has this to say, "The abiding vitality and adaptability of religion have been demonstrated. Under the clouds of war people drew nearer to their God. World calamity did not make people less religious but more religious. The consolations of faith were used for support in a time of trouble and uncertainty. Religion was the source of comfort in loss and sorrow. Religion was the staff for the man who must needs go through the valley of the shadow of death. And when victory came men and women went with joy and thanksgiving into the sanctuaries of worship. In the days that are to come, days of readjustment and reconstruction, when broken homes and broken fortunes must be rebuilt, when the conditions of a new order must be established, the chief dynamic of effort will be found to be a real religious faith".

A discriminating bibliography and a fairly satisfactory index close the volume and add to its value.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Spectrum of Religion.* By Loren M. Edwards.

12mo. Cloth. Pages 159. Price 75 cents net.

This is a unique volume. The author, who is a Methodist minister in Baltimore, Md., conceived the idea of preaching a series of Sunday evening discourses based on the replies to a questionnaire addressed to a group of 200 men representing widely different classes in the community, both religious and irreligious or non-religious. Subsequently the inquiry was greatly broadened until the replies numbered over 250, coming from different sections of the country and embracing many classes of men including a number of college and university men.

The questionnaire really consisted of only one question. "What is your idea of religion?" But the explanations accompanying it gave it a very broad signification and opened the way for a great deal of latitude in answering. Considerable portions of the answers received are quoted and make very interesting reading.

The title of the book can thus be understood, "The Spectrum of Religion". It is not so much an analysis of the various elements entering into or composing the pure white light of a true Christian faith and piety, as it is a presentation of the various reactions of many different minds and dispositions to Christian truth. There are seven chapters on The Religion of the Upward Reach,

The Religion of the Burning Heart, The Religion of the Struggling Soul, The Religion of the Daily Deed, The Religion of the Open Hand, The Religion of the Christian Church, and The Religion of the Forward Look.

The author has an interesting and forceful style, and the book is justly pronounced by the publishers "A modern, vital, practical, and human document".

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Day Break Everywhere.* By Charles Edward Locke. Cloth. Pp. 217. Price \$1.25.

The titles of the chapters of this book—such as The Rebirth of Liberty, The New Manhood, The New Duty, The New Ministry, The New Morality, The New Day—indicate its optimistic spirit. Its illustrations, and there are hundreds of them, are drawn chiefly from incidents of the World War, and may be profitably drawn upon by the preacher. Dr. Locke believes that we are living in the dawn of a new and better day—the day of love, self-sacrifice and faith.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY. NEW YORK.

*The Social Gospel and the New Era.* By John Marshall Barker, Ph. D. 12mo. Cloth. Pages 242. Price \$1.75.

Dr. Barker, the author of this volume, is Professor of Sociology in the School of Theology connected with Boston University. In a brief Foreword he announces his central purpose in writing the book to be "(1) to give a clearer and more adequate conception of the significance and value of the kingdom ideal and spirit. (2) To survey the widening fields of opportunity for social service in which the Church should enter and cooperate more earnestly to actualize the triumph of God in human affairs. (3) To suggest some of the well-tested methods in the field of experience by which an approach can be made through the coordination of social forces and collective action to make the Church a greater constructive agency in the social life of mankind".

This purpose is well carried out. In a brief "Introductory Note" Dr. Henry C. Sheldon names "comprehensiveness" and "balance" as the two most marked characteristics of the discussion. These are most desir-

able qualities in any book. They are especially valuable in a book dealing with social questions on which so much is written these days that is conspicuously lacking in just these qualities.

The entire discussion starts and is carried through from the standpoint of the Church, or from a consideration of the relation of the Church to the problem. This is indicated in the very titles of the several chapters, of which there are fifteen. All but the first two begin with the Church. For example, we have "The Church in Collective Action", "The Church and the Economic Life", "The Church and Religious Education", etc. The first two chapters are on "The Social Message", and "The Social Service Spirit". But there is no apparent reason why the titles of these two chapters might not have harmonized with all the others, and been made "The Church and the Social Message", and "The Church and the Social Service Spirit". The contents of the chapters would really suggest this.

All the chapters are interesting, suggestive and helpful. It is very gratifying, and not a little reassuring, to find a writer on the relation of the Church to the various phases of the social problem holding so sane and conservative views. All too often there is a disposition to hold the Church responsible for all the ills of society and for all the shortcomings of government, and to expect the Church to right all wrongs, correct all mistakes and bring in speedily a millenium of social righteousness, industrial justice and civic perfection. There is nothing of this kind in this book. The author clearly differentiates the functions of Church and State, and recognizes the fact that the chief business of the Church is to teach spiritual truth and to insist on individual righteousness. This will of course include the faithful and conscientious discharge of all the duties of citizenship by all socially awakened Christians.

The following paragraphs are quoted as a fair expression of the author's attitude of mind:

"Good government is not the result of accident. It is the necessary outgrowth of deep-seated conviction and of the concerted and well-directed efforts of the sovereign rights of citizenship. No other institution apart from the Church is adequate to marshal and guide the moral forces in society, to overcome the foes of decency and good order. A democracy rests upon the consent of the governed. Consent to any advanced public policy



depends upon public opinion. The Church is one of the strongest agencies to create and sustain public opinion".

"The Church in its corporate capacity is not primarily a political institution for enacting and enforcing laws. It is rather an association of believers who have affiliations with different political parties. Consequently it would be improper for the Church, made up of all parties, to become involved in partisan politics. The Church disclaims any desire to have an organic alliance with any political party as such".

"While it would be out of place for the local churches to engage directly in party politics, yet, when advisable, they should form a non-partisan joint agency to serve as a medium through which Christian people could express their convictions on issues related to public health and morals".

"The pulpit should not be a free forum for the discussion of partisan political questions; but it should be an agency for the ethical interpretation of the moral issues involved \* \* \* \* \* He is the natural exponent and interpreter of ethical principles applied to civic affairs \* \* \* \* He strives to bring his hearers to such a standard of civic righteousness that they will become pioneers in a public crusade against specific social wrongs in the community life".

"The preacher as a citizen and an individual may take an active part in party politics, but never in his character as a preacher. His function is to serve people of all parties \* \* \* \* \* When, however, a great moral issue is involved, and where the question pertains peculiarly to the general welfare of society, the preacher would be untrue to his calling if he did not, in his professional capacity, point out the ethical element and arouse his hearers to active participation in the triumph of the moral issue".

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Six Thousand Country Churches.* By Charles Otis Gill and Gifford Pinchot. 8vo. Cloth. Pages 237. Price \$2.00 net.

This volume was published in November of last year and immediately attracted much attention and wide comment especially from the religious press. It contains the results of a religious "survey" of the state of Ohio made under the auspices of the Commission on Church and Country Life of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The same authors had published

in 1913, under the authority of the Federal Council, the results of an inquiry into the religious condition of two counties in eastern states, one in Vermont and one in New York. It was the facts there disclosed that led to the organization of the Commission on Church and Country Life, and also to the determination to make a thorough investigation of the country churches in an entire state. The state of Ohio was selected for this purpose and the execution of the task was committed to Messrs. Gill and Pinchot.

The results as given in this volume are certainly startling. It is doubtful whether anyone not already familiar with the facts could have been made to believe that in a state like Ohio, one of the oldest and wealthiest states in the Middle West, and one of the most important and influential states in the Union, such lamentable moral and religious conditions could be found as here revealed.

It is impossible, in a brief summary, to give any adequate conception of the facts presented. A suggestion of them may be gathered from such sentences as the following from Chapter III. "In Ohio more than 4,500, or 66 per cent. of the rural churches have a membership of 100 or less; more than 3,600, or 55 per cent. have a membership of 75 or less, more than 2,400, or 37 per cent. a membership of 50 or less". "The membership of these country churches is small, but the attendance is smaller still. The data available indicates that ordinarily it is less than half the membership". "More than 4,400, or about two-thirds, of the churches in rural Ohio, and 39 per cent. of the villages are without resident ministers, while in the open country only 360, or 13 per cent. of the 2,807 churches have resident pastors".

The worst conditions were found in the southern and southeastern parts of the state. "Here in a region covering at least eighteen counties, the failure of the churches may fairly be called pathetic". "In this area, after more than a hundred years of the work of the churches, the religious, social, and economic welfare of the people are going down. Although the churches have been here for more than a century, no normal type of organized religion is really flourishing, while the only kind which, during the past fifteen years, has been gaining ground, the cult of the Holy Rollers, is scarcely better than that of a Dervish. The churches have failed and are failing to dispel ignorance and superstition, to

prevent the increase of vice, the spread of disease, and the general moral and spiritual decadence of the people".

One of the chief objects in making this survey and publishing this volume was to stimulate the churches of all denominations in the state and in the country at large to cooperate in the adoption of some workable policy and program by which the average country church may be made more efficient, and conditions improved. Two methods are suggested. One of them is an exchange of churches and ministers between the different denominations by which weak charges may be strengthened, the number of pastors required to serve them be reduced, better salaries be paid; and better qualified and more efficient men secured. The other is that of the federated or community church, in which all the people of a community unite in one congregation and in the support of a pastor and the maintenance of services, without necessarily surrendering their peculiar denominational beliefs of even membership. This is the plan favored by the authors, and a number of cases are cited in which it seems to have had a remarkable success.

Certainly, if the statements made in this volume are correct, and especially if it is true as maintained, that similar conditions, and even worse, prevail in many other rural communities, then every true Christian, and every true American, must realize that it is time that something should be done to improve them. We have a conviction that the general condition of our Lutheran churches in rural communities in very much better than that here reported. Indeed, there are comparatively few Lutheran churches in the counties of Ohio in which the worst conditions are reported. At the same time, we must recognize the fact that we have many weak country churches which need and should have the fostering care of the Church as a whole. We must also recognize the fact that as Christians we have a responsibility for and a duty towards these neglected parts of our country which we cannot and should not desire to shirk.

We might add that this volume contains a great number of maps, and charts, and tables, which greatly assist the reader in understanding and appreciating the facts presented.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The New Social Order: Principles and Program.* By Harry F. Ward, Professor of Christian Ethics in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. 8vo. Cloth. Pages IX 385. Price \$2.50.

After reading this book one is not surprised that Professor Ward has been accused of being a socialist, and even a Bolshevik. To the first charge he would probably plead guilty, but hardly to the second save as Bolshevism may be accepted as being in many of its aims a form of Socialism.

As Professor Ward informs us in the preface, the background of his discussion is "the conviction, which has been maturing through the years, that a new order of social living is necessary for both the practical and the spiritual interests of humanity". He goes even farther than this. He says, "The events of the last few years have intensified that conviction and have added to it the judgment that the beginnings of a new order are already with us, that here and there parts of it may be seen breaking through the shell of the old, which has long been nourishing the embryo. This does not mean that state socialism is going to be universally adopted or that the world is going Bolshevik. Still less does it mean that the organization of a League of Nations will inaugurate the millenium. The signs are clear, however, that we have arrived at one of those conjunctions of economic pressure and idealistic impulse, which occasion fundamental changes in the organization of life."

As to method, the author announces that his book "views the new order as a process of growth, with its roots in the past. It therefore discusses the principles round which it is forming, and then attempts to analyze in the light of them the main programs for social change that have been recently offered".

His "standpoint" is declared to be that of a "teacher of Christian ethics. The principles here considered are germinal in the teaching of Jesus\*\*\*\*The new order is fundamentally a task for religion as well as for economic and social science and practical organization. It involves a spiritual transformation or it cannot be".

"In form, the discussion is an attempt to summarize the nature and chart the direction of the impending social change. The discussion of the various programs is by no means complete; it is limited to their relationship to the principles which have been expounded. Those

who are familiar with this field will find nothing new here, unless it be the religious aspect of the discussion, for sometimes the spiritual significance of well-known things escapes the wise as well as the prudent"

We have quoted thus largely from the preface in order that Professor Ward might have the opportunity to speak for himself, and that those who may read this review may thus get his point of view and his purpose in his own words.

The book is divided into two parts prefaced by an introductory chapter on The Nature of the New Order, and followed by a concluding chapter on The Trend of Progress.

The title of the introductory chapter suggests the general nature of its contents. We do not find there, however, any very clear or definite description of the "new order" such as we would naturally expect. The nearest approach to it may be found in the following sentences from page 31: "In form, the new order will be the application of the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity to economic organization. The organization of economic democracy will constitute a greater change in human affairs than the development of political democracy, because it touches more of the relationships of life and touches them more intimately. It affects the sources and means of nourishment for all social institutions, for the family, education and religion; it has also to do with their nature and purpose. It is the whole manner of doing the work of the world and of living together that is in vital respects to be changed if democracy is to complete itself in economic relations".

Part I deals with the Principles of the New Order. These are Equality, Universal Service, Efficiency, The Supremacy of Personality, and Solidarity. A chapter is devoted to the discussion of each of these. It would be interesting to go through these chapters and quote freely as we have done from the preface so as to allow the author to speak for himself. But for this we do not have space. A few sentences must suffice taken almost at random here and there. From the chapter on Equality: "Political democracy rests upon the principle of equal rights for all; social democracy shouts the slogan of equal opportunities for all, and thereby gives a new challenge to the democratic state". From the chapter on Universal Service: "It is an axiom that equal rights involve equal obligations. A world in which individuals,

and classes, and nations are simply struggling to obtain their own rights, is a world in which selfishness, with all its disintegrating and destructive consequences, is constantly stimulated. Equal rights and equal opportunities are only the first part of the chapter of democracy. The completion of the charter is equal obligation and universal service. Here are the two corner stones for democracy, either within or between the nations; on the one hand equality of rights, on the other hand equality of obligation". And this: "In a genuine democracy, the principle of universal service would continually call for the strong as leaders and not as rulers; as servants and not as masters. The democratic community which shuts the door against the possibility of mastery and privilege by those of special ability will open another door still wider in the opportunity for leadership". One more quotation from the chapter on The Supremacy of Personality: "An economic order exists to produce wealth not for wealth's sake, but for the upbuilding of the people. To that end, and in whatever forms will best promote it, wealth production and wealth ownership and distribution must be socialized; they must be carried on for the common good. When they are carried on for the individual good their effect is always to break down and finally overthrow the standard of the supremacy of personality. But when they are safeguarded by common control for the common purpose, society comes to value creation above acquisition, the economic machinery as adjusted to produce life, and goods only as they increase life. Then the increase of personality becomes the supreme objective of social organization while property falls into its proper place as the base upon which man stands to derive from it nourishment for his spiritual development".

Part II also contains five chapters on the Programs for the New Order. The chapter headings are, The British Labor Party, The Russian Soviet Republic, The League of Nations, Some Movements in the United States, and The Churches. Of these chapters the one on The Russian Soviet Republic will likely be read with the greatest interest because of the general desire to know more about this movement, and also because of the intense prejudice which has been excited against the Bolsheviks by reason of their frightful excesses and their horrible brutalities. There is of course no attempt on the part of Professor Ward to defend these excesses or



to gloss them over. But he does make the claim that in judging any program for changing the social order we must distinguish "between aim and methods, also between method that is essential to aim and method that is incidental to the situation in which the aim is attempted". Evidently he thinks that most of the excesses of the Russian Bolsheviks belong to the latter class, and that they are not therefore necessarily to be held as against the general Bolshevik program, or against the purposes which the leaders of the Russian revolution have had in view. The distinction which Professor Ward makes is a valid one; it is doubtful, however, whether we as yet have sufficient, or sufficiently accurate, information to enable us to judge fairly of even the spirit and aims of the revolutionists.

Professor Ward finds much to commend in the aims of the Russian Soviet Republic. He believes also that all the nations will have to reckon with this movement sooner or later, and that there will be little or no industrial or economic peace until its aims have been recognized and accomplished at least in large measure. For example, he says, on page 239: "In a deeper sense than President Wilson ever meant or has given any evidence of knowing, Russia is still the acid test of our democracy. Altogether apart from its methods, the Soviet Government has raised the issue in practical politics of the difference between a society in which all share in the burdens and privileges and a society in which some are permitted special favor and special exemption. There is no compromise possible here, any more than there is possible a compromise with Prussian autocracy. There was a conflict of ethical principles between the autocratic state and the democratic state. The same thing is true concerning a class-divided social order split by exploitation and one which is solidified by universal mutual service. The absolute conflict between the ethics of strife and power, and the ethics of cooperative service has long been recognized. Now the issue has been joined in the field of action by the organization of the Soviet Government, and in different forms and in varying time it will go to conclusion throughout the world".

The discussions of the Peace Conference at Paris and the League of Nations are also very interesting, but we cannot go into these. The entire volume gives evidence all through of careful thought on the many problems involved, and the discussion of them is always suggestive



and thought compelling. No doubt many of his readers will differ radically with the positions taken by Professor Ward, and also with the conclusions reached. But all will have to recognize his earnestness and sincerity, and those who differ with him will not always find it easy, if they are equally honest and sincere, to controvert his positions or to overthrow his conclusions. We regard the book as a valuable contribution to the current discussion of the social and economic problems which are facing us, and heartily recommend all who are interested in this subject to read it and study it.

We regret that the volume is not furnished with an adequate index. It would have added a great deal to its value to the general reader and especially to the student.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*A Commentary on the First Book of Samuel.* By Loring W. Batten, Ph.D. Prof. of Old Testament in the General Theological Seminary, New York. Cloth. 12 mo. Pp. 231. Price \$1.40.

This is one of the volumes in *The Bible for Home and School* series. The point of view of Dr. Batten is that this book, together with Joshua, Judges, 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings, "were compiled not as an accurate record of the nation's history, but as stories meant to teach great moral lessons", and "that the compilers were not critically discriminating in the use of their material". Hence the reader must be on his guard not too readily to accept the attempted reconstruction. The comments are well arranged and lucid and embody much information. It is rather startling to read that David was "not necessarily a kid" when he slew Goliath. P. 139.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Theology as an Empirical Science.* By Douglas Clyde MacIntosh, Ph.D. Pp. 270. Price \$2.00.

Time will not permit us to make all criticism that this book ought to have. Among its merits may be mentioned its intellectual quality. It certainly is a labored attempt to reduce theology to an empirical science, however short it may fall of the goal at which it has aimed. The author is a Doctor of Philosophy, and his work on every page indicates the depth of his philosophical studies. Although he does not claim the degree of Doctor of Theology on the title-page, we are there informed that he is

Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University. He is known as the author of several previous works of a scholarly character. His researches in philosophy have determined his style of presentation, and have greatly colored his theological views. You must understand the abstruse terms of philosophy to understand his writing.

In reviewing such a book we do not like to skim the surface; yet we cannot take time to go into the depths of it and analyze it critically in all its positions. We agree with the author that Christian theology is an empirical science. Not only do we believe it to be so in the restricted sense in which he uses the word "empirical" (see page 2), but also in the wider sense of dealing with clearly observed and well-validated data from which legitimate inductions may be drawn. However, the grave fault of this work is this: it whittles Christian experience down to the "irreducible minimum," and that minimum is reached by a labored rationalizing process, and not, after all, by a full, clear, simple, joyous Christian experience. And what is this much-shrunken "minimum" of Christian faith? It is that the God of the universe is sufficiently dependable, and so His universe is dependable, and Christ is the one person in history who best taught this doctrine and exemplified it in His life and experience. Even God may not be omnipotent, but He is sufficiently powerful to hold the sovereignty of the cosmos in His hands, and so we may rely on Him for help. Relevant to the last point, just how, we beg to know, does the Christian soul *experience* that God is powerful enough to be trustworthy even though He may not be omnipotent? No; such an attenuated doctrine is not a matter of experience; it is a rationalistic conclusion. But even at that it is not good, cogent reasoning; for if God were not all-powerful, and if, therefore, there were the least *strain* upon Him in upholding the universe, He would by and by, as the age-cycles pass, grow weary, and the universe would *drop*. If we are going to use reason instead of experience, let us make our rational processes more thorough-going.

As our author whittles down experience to the minimum, so he deals with the Bible, the Old and New Testaments alike. For example, he gets back to the only New Testament "sources" he is willing to acknowledge: they are Mark, and St. Paul's letters. But even these he pares to the "irreducible minimum". Mark gives the record of many miracles. Indeed, in proportion to its

length, Mark tells of more miracles than any other evangelist. But Dr. MacIntosh cannot admit these miracles, and therefore he criticises and reduces even his original sources, and either cuts out the accounts of the miracles or tries to explain them on some kind of naturalistic ground. These supernatural occurrences do not fit into "the modern mind". Even the resurrection is denied, and the ascension of Christ to the right hand of God is laughed out of court as opposed to our modern views of astronomy, which are no longer geocentric.

We beg to ask whether this rationalistic denial of Biblical miracles can properly belong to "empirical" or "experimental" theology. Has any one ever learned by actual experience that the miracles did *not* occur? On the contrary, is it not a fact that many persons in the history of the Church who could not, in their natural state, believe in the supernatural element in the Bible, have been convinced of its reality by a genuine experience of regeneration. Usually the man who has had such an experience, no matter what his previous predictions may have been, has no difficulty in accepting the Bible miracles. Did the apostles get their experience, for whose verity they were willing to suffer and die, with or without miracles? Is it not true that the great Christian souls of the centuries who have had a great religious experience, one that made them flaming evangelists and defenders of the faith, were brought to believe in the Biblical miracles through the experience of conversion? No; our author makes Christian experience too meager a thing to be of real value to the soul and to fill it with missionary zeal.

As he cannot tolerate miracles, so, of course, he cannot endure the doctrine of the miraculous conception of Christ by the Virgin Mary. Listen to him (page 53): "In view, then, of these various strands of damaging evidence, and since, apart from this story, there is no basis for supposing that human parthenogenesis is even possible, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that the virgin-birth story is a legend, comparable with the similar, although more crudely expressed, birth-legends that grew up about Greek and Roman heroes, and such religious personalities as Gautama (the Buddha), Krishna and Shakara." We might quote more to the same effect, but our sense of reverence is already sufficiently shocked by the above sentence. Our author devotes about a page and a third to the virgin-birth, and then lightly dis-

misses it as unworthy of belief. What are we to think of such scant treatment of a vital doctrine in view of the great and searching works of Orr, Sweet, Knowling and Thorburn in vindication of our Lord's virgin birth? No; the liberalist cannot get rid of the great mass of facts and arguments that these scholars present simply by ignoring them. Moreover, does a rejection of the miraculous conception of our Lord belong to the content of a Christian experience? We trow not. Then how can such categorical denial belong to a system of "empirical" theology? On the other hand, Christian history will be likely to afford indubitable proof that the most thorough-going Christian experience has always come with acceptance of this doctrine. And why not? What is one of the outstanding elements of a complete and joyful Christian assurance? Surely that Christ was a supernatural being. Then he must have had a supernatural conception.

As for the doctrine of a substitutional atonement, in which Christ really made expiation for sin by suffering the penalty of transgression in the stead of sinners, our author will have none of it. All the Biblical passages in both the Old and New Testaments that teach the doctrine of substitution are ruled out as speculations, illusions or later accretions. But that is rationalism, not empiricism. No one has ever experienced that Christ did *not* die to make propitiation for sin. Speculative theology may reject the doctrine of vicarious atonement, but experimental theology never can. On the contrary, we wonder whether many a Christian does not today experience the joy of pardon and salvation when he reads such passages as these: "He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities . . . and with His stripes we are healed;" "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and gave His Son to be the propitiation for our sins;" "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many". We venture to say that millions of Christian men, women and children have received their assurance of truth, pardon and salvation through the impingement and appeal of such passages as the above, accepted in their literal sense and at their face value.

But we must not amplify further. We venture to say that a real, full, positive Christian experience, an experience "at its best," is not the be-littled and be-whittl-

ed experience this author depicts. We also venture to assert that our orthodox systems of theology are based more soundly upon an empirical foundation than is the slender structure of this Yale professor. And, by the way, have our American theologians and religious thinkers learned no lessons from the war? It is said that rationalism has been one of the chief causes of the downfall of the great German empire. In spite of this sad and terrible example, there has never been a year in the history of our own country when the *liberalistic* output of books was so large as it was in the year 1919. Mr. MacIntosh is a teacher of youth in a great American university. Sad to say, his work is only one of many similar works recently issued.

L. S. KEYSER.

*Springfield, Ohio.*

THE ABINGDON PRESS. NEW YORK.

*Religion and War.* William Herbert Perry Faunce.  
12mo. Cloth. Pages 188. Price \$1.00 net.

This book contains six lectures delivered at DePauw University as the Mendenhall Lectures. They were delivered during the war. The close of the war would change the tense of a verb here and there but not make necessary other changes in the book. The six lectures fall into three groups of two each; the attitude of the Bible towards war, the attitude of present day thought, and a look toward the future.

The history of the chosen people is one of almost continuous war, and war as bloody, as inhuman, as ruthless as is to be found anywhere in history. The narrative considers it all as according to and as pleasing to Jehovah and as done to his honor. An extremely interesting series of parallels are given comparing quotations from the historical books and the imprecatory Psalms with those from German sources regarding the war. The later books and especially the great prophets breathe an entirely different spirit. Similarly in the New Testament. Verses may be quoted, and are, on both sides. The question is one of applied religion and the teaching of the New Testament very rarely takes a decided stand on such questions. It is more interested in the character of men. There is no question but that if men and nations lived according to the teaching of the New Testament, war would cease.

But, it is rather remarkable that the majority of the pacifists have been men outside of the church and that many of the staunchest defenders of war have been churchmen. But the explanation is not so difficult. To the rationalist war is unreasoning and so cannot be defended. He is also usually a believer in the essential goodness of mankind and argues that man will not be unreasonable if given a chance. And lastly he reasons away many of the things for which men fight. He will not fight because he does not recognize anything as worth fighting for. And just as the German fights brutally because he does not consider the moral values of sufficient force to restrain him, the pacifist will not fight because he also undervalues them.

The church, it has been charged, failed during the war. But so did every other agency. Science, philosophy, socialism, diplomacy, all failed. But the church did not come forth with the moral leadership that might have been expected. A great work was done by Christian people but it was done through other agencies. Will the church be ready to meet the task of reconstruction after the war? Christianity is the only hope but it must be a spiritual revival and not an organization. Past history is that the reform comes from outside the ecclesiastical organization. Will it be repeated? There are many hopeful signs. Men have been shaken out of the old ruts, have been stirred to see the value of the things of the spirit, are ready for big things and for an active, strong leadership. But it will not be found in the old theology. There must be a new conception of God, of Man and of Society. "The church of the future will care much less about saving its tenets or its ritual, but care ever more and more about saving alive the quality of spirit that was in the Nazarene. To have that quality is to be in the Kingdom and to possess the only real title to the fellowship of the Christian Church". "The real problem is the reconstruction of the social order so that in it may be visibly embodied the ideals of the Christian faith. Human society must be reconstituted on the basis of love". There must be no hesitation, no compromise. The reconstruction must be complete and thoroughgoing. The task is tremendous but there is no choice. It is either a society based on love or on the machine-gun. It calls for courage but "the real religion of

valor is the religion of Jesus", and we must dedicate ourselves to the task of constructing a new world.

FRANK H. CLUTZ.

*The Confessions of a Browning Lover.* By John Walker Powell. Cloth. Pp. 248. Price \$1.00.

The author looks upon Browning as a teacher of the essential truths of Christianity in a form free from specific dogmas and acceptable to present day science and philosophy in their truest aspects. He holds that Browning was primarily an artist rather than a philosopher. He is a great interpreter of the souls of men "in well-nigh every conceivable attitude of hope and fear, of joy and sorrow, of hate and love." In regard to the reality of the divine existence and the manifestation of God's character Browning finds its chief evidence in Jesus Christ. The belief in immortality is expressed and connoted in numerous passages. "Browning will give no place to doubt or fear. He casts himself boldly on the goodness of God and the veracity of human instincts, and lives in the length and breadth of the Infinite."

Dr. Powell has proved his contention that Browning is a true interpreter of life and of faith.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Germany's Moral Downfall.* Alexander W. Crawford. 12mo. Cloth. Pages 217 Price \$1.00 net.

This is a contribution to the War after the War. Germany has been defeated in a military sense but the same things that made Germany such a menace are still to be conquered. If they are known and recognized as the evil they are, they will not be so dangerous. The Hohenzollerns have never changed from the time when they were highwaymen and noted for their high exactions. They had by devious means made themselves masters of Prussia, a people noted for their brutality ever since they have been known to history. Three unscrupulous wars made Prussia the master of Germany. Since, there has been one long preparation to make her the master of the world.

To do this it was necessary to destroy Germany's moral sense. How complete the success, the conduct of the war proves. Everything was bent to this end. Philosophy, science, even religion, were made to contribute to the proposition that the only thing worth con-



sidering was the material result. Men who fell in with this programme were advanced and helped to spread their propaganda. The entire scheme of education was to prove Germany the one great people, and the whole end and aim of existence of the German must be to further his country and her glory. No moral restrictions, no obligations of treaty or law that appeared to stand in the way deserved any respect.

For a time Germany was so successful in all the material ways of progress that the world was blinded to the essential danger in her course and German thought and science have been of power. Now that the mask has been stripped off by the war, these things must be fought wherever they are found.

The book is partly made up of editorials which have been rewritten, but they still show the signs of their origin. The references are to a few of the most popularly known writers. There is much repetition and the whole is cast in a popular style. It is a good presentation of the central thesis but adds very little to what has been rather general knowledge since the early years of the war.

FRANK H. CLUTZ.

*From a Soldier's Heart.* By Harold Speakman, First Lieut. of Infantry, 332 Regiment, U. S. A.. Cloth. Pp. 163. Illustrated. Price net \$1.25.

This is a war-book of a permanent character, giving glimpses of the soldier's life in England, France, the Balkans and especially Italy. Lieutenant Speakman is not only a brave soldier whose honor it was to participate in the last "great offensive from Mount Grappa to the Adriatic" but whose gift it is to know how to tell his story. His eyes saw more and his heart felt more deeply than those of the average soldier. Now deep pathos and now a bit of humor mellow and brighten the pages, and there is the undercurrent of religious faith and hope through the whole book. It is pleasant reading and will survive for years and years.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Premillennialism, Non-Scriptural, Non-Historic, Non-Scientific, Non-Philosophical.* By George Preston Mains. Cloth. 12 mo. Pp. 160. Price \$1.00 net.

Dr. Mains has shown in brief compass that Premillennialism is an untenable doctrine, unsupported by

scholarship, history or exegesis. It is a Jewish specter projected into the Christian age by unfounded hopes, by a false philosophy and un-Christian pessimism. The treatment of the subject is popular and vigorous. The absurdity and impossibility of a pre-millennial reign of Christ at Jerusalem are strikingly set forth.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE GORHAM PRESS, BOSTON, MASS.

*The Person of Christ and His Presence in Lord's Supper.*

By Jeremiah Zimmerman, D.D., LL.D. Cloth. 8mo.  
Pp. 314. Price \$1.50 net.

This treatise is an amplification of Dr. Zimmerman's lecture on the Lord's Supper delivered on the Holman foundation at the Gettysburg Seminary a year ago. In seven lucid chapters he sets forth The Christ of the Lord's Supper, The Passover, The Real Presence, Consensus of Opinion among Theologians, The Analogy of Faith, Christ's Glorified Body in the Eucharist, and Side Lights from Comparative Religion.

The opening chapter, occupying a fourth of the book, lays the foundation securely for the doctrine of the real presence. The Christ who is present is none other than the Divine, human Son of God, whose deity is established by many indubitable evidences. Accepting the verdict of revelation and history that Jesus is the adorable Son of the Most High, the believer has no difficulty in seeing him in the blessed sacrament of the Holy Supper.

The chapter on the Passover, whose fulfilment is found in the Lord's Supper, gives a vivid description of the celebration of the Passover on Mt. Gerezim, as witnessed by Dr. Zimmerman some years ago.

The heart of the volume lies in its statement of the Scriptural and Lutheran teaching that the Supper is not a mere symbol, but actually a vehicle of grace and of union with Christ. His presence is not, of course, carnal; but yet He gives us His flesh and blood in glorified form. This is a mystery like other manifestations of God; but this is certainly not surprising, rather it is what we may expect. Dr. Andrews, of Scotland, is quoted as saying, "Taking all these facts together, it becomes very doubtful whether any theory that falls short of the Lutheran doctrine, will adequately explain the utterances of St. Paul in reference to the Eucharist."

Dr. Zimmerman presents his subject in a simple and popular manner, which should coin him many readers.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE UNITED LUTHERAN PUBLICATION HOUSE, PHILA., PA.  
*Lincoln's Gettysburg World Message.* By Henry Eyster  
Jacobs. Cloth. Pp. 133. Price \$1.00 postpaid.

Doctor Jacob's account of Lincoln's address at Gettysburg differs from many other published accounts in that it is the work of an eye-witness. The son of Professor Michael Jacobs of Pennsylvania College, he lived in Gettysburg and not only observed the events of July 1st, 2nd and 3rd and November 19th, 1863, but recorded his impressions at the time; therefore his description is not only interesting but authentic.

He prefaces his account of the address by a description of the town and the surrounding country and the battle, and follows it with a keen analysis of Lincoln's message, and of his ruling principles of statesmanship. He notes Lincoln's gravity of aspect, the attention with which he was heard, the deep impression made upon the audience, and their surprise at the brevity of his remarks. His further comment and analysis is the fruit of long meditation upon the utterances of Lincoln. He believes that the Battle of Gettysburg will be remembered while other battles are forgotten "because of the interpretation given . . . by one who was not only Commander-in-chief of the armies of the Union . . . but also the great prophet of the cause of civil and religious liberty. The battle itself was only the prelude to the still mightier force that was transmitted in his telling word, which not only sounded the rallying cry for the final struggle of the war . . . but which unintentionally gave the signal for the assertion throughout the world of great principles that had hitherto been suppressed."

The College and Seminary at Gettysburg have a close connection with the events of 1863. The buildings were used as points of observation and as hospitals, and the students were the first citizens of Gettysburg to respond to the governor's appeal for troops to defend the state. Professor Jacobs, Senior, was consulted by the officers of the signal corps and gave important advice, and President Baugher pronounced the benediction at the dedication of the cemetery. The publication of this book, small in size, but large in value, by an honored graduate of the College and the Seminary is therefore most appropriate. It is also timely. Its subject is perpetually interesting to our own nation and to liberty loving peoples everywhere, and its style fresh and vigorous.

E. S. L.

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is a religious magazine owned and controlled by its editors. It is not, however, to be regarded as their personal organ, neither is it published for private profit but solely in the interests of the Church. It is always open to contributors regardless of denominational affiliation, but its chief purpose is to be the medium for the discussion of theological, religious, historical and social questions from the view-point of the Lutheran Church, especially that portion of it known as the General Synod.

The editors of the QUARTERLY stand firmly and uncompromisingly for the orthodox faith as confessed by the Lutheran Church, and never knowingly publish any article which attacks or discredits the fundamental doctrines or principles of the Christian religion. Within these limits they regard the QUARTERLY as a forum for courteous and scholarly discussion. Without such liberty the truth in its many phases can not be developed.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors who are amenable to the discipline of the Church alone. Neither does the publication of an article mean that they endorse all the views which it presents. Should any of the contributors fall into serious error, or present false and dangerous views, they may and usually will be corrected in subsequent issues by the editors, or by others.

The editors believe that on this basis the QUARTERLY will commend itself to its readers and to all intelligent and thoughtful Lutheran ministers and laymen who are cordially invited to become subscribers.

# **The Common Service Book**

**The Official Service and Hymnal of the  
United Lutheran Church.**

**Contents:**

Calendar  
The Service  
Matins  
Vespers  
Lessons, etc.  
Prayers  
The Psalms  
The Canticles  
History of the Passion  
The New Occasional Services  
General Rubrics  
The Small Catechism  
The Hymnal

The book contains a wealth of Liturgical and Hymnological  
material

Unity and Uniformity in the United Lutheran Church will be  
assured with the general use of this book

**Three Editions**

Words, (Small) price \$1.15 to \$5.00 according to binding.

Words, (Large) Standard Text edition. Price \$1.35 to \$6.00  
according to binding.

Music Edition Contains music for the liturgy and for all the  
hymns of the official collection. \$2.00 up ac-  
cording to binding.

## **THE UNITED LUTHERAN PUBLICATION HOUSE**

**S. E. COR. NINTH AND SANSON STREETS,  
PHILADELPHIA, PA.**

Southern Headquarters 437 Fifth Ave. 159 N. State St. 212 Ninth St.  
Columbia, S. C. New York Chicago Pittsburgh

